987

United States Department of State

# United States Participation in the UN

## Report by the President to the Congress for the year 1987

S1.70/8:

READEX FICHE best copy available

United States Department of State

# United States Participation in the UN

## Report by the President
## to the Congress
## for the year 1987

DEPARTMENT OF STATE PUBLICATION 9671

Bureau of International Organization Affairs

*Released September 1988*

For Sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

## Contents

Acronyms and Short Forms ........ xiii

PART 1. POLITICAL AND SECURITY AFFAIRS
- Security Council ........ 1
- General Assembly ........ 3
- Peaceful Settlement ........ 5
  - Middle East ........ 5
    - Security Council Consideration ........ 5
      - Situation in the Occupied Territories ........ 5
      - Lebanon ........ 6
      - UN Interim Force in Lebanon ........ 7
      - UN Disengagement Observer Force ........ 7
    - General Assembly Consideration ........ 7
      - Israeli Credentials ........ 7
      - Situation in the Middle East ........ 8
      - Question of Palestine ........ 10
      - Israeli Practices in Occupied Territories ........ 11
      - Armed Israeli Action Against Iraqi Nuclear Installations ........ 14
      - Cooperation Between the United Nations and the League of Arab States ........ 14
      - UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestinian Refugees in the Near East ........ 15
  - Conflict Between Iran and Iraq ........ 16
    - Security Council Consideration ........ 16
      - July Resolution ........ 16
      - Chemical Weapons ........ 18
    - General Assembly Consideration ........ 18
  - Afghanistan ........ 19
  - Cambodia ........ 20
    - Credentials at the General Assembly ........ 20
    - General Assembly Consideration ........ 20
  - South African Policies of Apartheid and Related Issues ........ 21
    - Security Council Consideration ........ 21
      - Situation in South Africa ........ 21
      - Angolan Complaint ........ 22
    - General Assembly Consideration ........ 24
      - Policies of Apartheid ........ 24
  - Other African Questions ........ 29
    - Comorian Island of Mayotte ........ 29
    - Cooperation Between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity ........ 29

    - Observer Status for the African Development Bank in the General Assembly 29
  - Falkland Islands (Malvinas) Question 30
  - Situation in Central America 31
    - General Assembly Consideration 31
      - ICJ Decision on Nicaragua 31
      - Nicaraguan Trade Embargo 31
  - Other Latin American and Caribbean Questions 32
    - Cooperation Between the United Nations and the Organization of American States 32
    - Cooperation Between the United Nations and the Latin American Economic System 32
  - Cyprus 33
- Disarmament and Arms Control 33
  - UN Disarmament Commission 33
  - Conference on Disarmament 36
    - *Ad Hoc* Committees 37
      - Chemical Weapons 37
      - Outer Space Arms Control 37
      - Radiological Weapons 38
      - Comprehensive Program of Disarmament 38
      - Negative Security Assurances 38
    - Other Issues 38
      - Nuclear Test Ban 38
      - Prevention of Nuclear War 39
      - Cessation of the Nuclear Arms Race and Nuclear Disarmament 39
      - Membership 39
  - General Assembly Consideration 40
    - First Committee Disarmament Issues 40
    - Third Special Session of the General Assembly Devoted to Disarmament 42
    - Prevention of Nuclear War 43
    - Radiological Weapons 44
    - Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space 45
    - Israeli Nuclear Armament 45
    - Verification and Compliance 46
    - Bilateral Nuclear-Arms Negotiations 47
    - Non-Use of Nuclear Weapons 49
    - Nuclear Freeze 50
    - Chemical and Biological Weapons 51
    - Comprehensive Test Ban 53
    - Cut-off of Fissionable Material for Weapons Purposes 54
    - World Disarmament Campaign 55
    - Reduction of Military Budgets 56
    - New Types of Weapons of Mass Destruction 56
    - Negative Security Assurances 57

  - Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones .......... 59
    - Protocol I of the Treaty of Tlatelolco .......... 59
    - African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone .......... 60
    - Middle East Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone .......... 61
    - South Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone .......... 62
  - Indian Ocean Zone of Peace .......... 62
  - South Atlantic Zone of Peace .......... 63
  - Disarmament and Development .......... 64
  - Comprehensive Program of Disarmament .......... 66
  - Confidence-Building Measures and the CDE .......... 66
  - Institutional Issues .......... 67
- Antarctica .......... 70
  - General Assembly .......... 71
- Outer Space .......... 72
  - UN Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space .......... 72
    - Scientific and Technical Subcommittee .......... 72
    - Legal Subcommittee .......... 73
    - General Assembly Consideration .......... 73
- Law of the Sea .......... 74
- General Political Problems .......... 76
  - Membership .......... 76
  - Question of Peacekeeping .......... 76
    - Peacekeeping Committee .......... 76
    - General Assembly .......... 76
  - Efforts Toward Strengthening the United Nations .......... 77
    - Charter Committee .......... 77
    - General Assembly .......... 77
  - Questions Relating to Information .......... 78

## PART 2. ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND HUMAN RIGHTS AFFAIRS

- Introduction .......... 81
  - Economic and Development Activities .......... 83
    - The Critical Economic Situation in Africa .......... 83
    - International Development Strategy .......... 84
    - Long-Term Trends in Economic Development .......... 84
    - Economic Commission for Europe .......... 85
    - Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific .......... 86
    - Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean .......... 87
    - Economic Commission for Africa .......... 88
    - Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia .......... 89
    - UN Development Program (UNDP) .......... 90
      - Governing and Advisory Bodies .......... 91
      - Secretariat and Field Organization .......... 91

Program Development 92
Patterns of Development Assistance 92
Activities and Analysis 92
UN Volunteers 95
UN Capital Development Fund 96
UN Industrial Development Organization 97
Introduction 97
UNIDO Meetings 98
Activities in 1987 98
Program and Budget Planning Process 98
1986–1987 Budget Supplemental Request 99
Program Budget for 1988–1989 99
Arrearages in U.S. Assessed Contributions 99
Political Issues 99
Miscellaneous Decisions 100
Investment Promotion Service 100
System of Consultations 100
General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) 101
UN Conference on Trade and Development 103
Substantial New Program of Action for the Least Developed Countries (SNPA) 105
Commission on Transnational Corporations 106
UN Children's Fund (UNICEF) 107
Structure and Functions 107
Programs 107
The Child Survival and Development Revolution 108
Funding 110
1987 Session of the UNICEF Executive Board 110
U.S. Presence in UNICEF 112
UNICEF Expenditures in the United States 112
Human Settlements Activities 112
Population Activities 114
The World Food Council 116
Social Issues 117
Crime Prevention and Control 117
Committee on Crime Prevention and Control 117
Drug Abuse Control 117
UN General Assembly and ECOSOC 118
Commission on Narcotic Drugs 119
Draft Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances 120
Drug Scheduling 121
Other CND Action 121

            UN Drug Control Agencies.................................... 121
            International Conference on Drug Abuse and
                Illicit Trafficking (ICDAIT)............................ 123
        UN Disaster Relief Office (UNDRO).............................. 127
            Decade of Natural Disasters Reduction................ 129
            Reform of UNDRO.................................................. 130
        UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR).......... 131
            International Legal Protection.............................. 132
            General Assembly................................................. 132
            UNHCR Programs.................................................. 135
                Africa.............................................................. 135
                Asia ................................................................ 135
                Europe and North America.......................... 136
                Latin America.............................................. 136
                Southwest Asia, North Africa, and
                    the Middle East...................................... 136
        Social Development......................................................... 137
            Interregional Consultation on
                Social Development...................................... 137
            Aging and Elderly.................................................. 137
            Disabled.................................................................. 137
            Youth. ..................................................................... 138
    Science, Technology, and Research.......................................... 138
        UN Environment Program (UNEP)................................ 138
            The Governing Council........................................ 139
            The Montreal Protocol.......................................... 142
            UNEP Issues at the General Assembly................. 143
        UN Scientific Committee on the Effects of
            Atomic Radiation.................................................. 143
        New and Renewable Sources of Energy (NRSE)........... 144
        Science and Technology for Development..................... 145
        UN University ...................................................................... 147
        University for Peace......................................................... 148
        UN Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR)....... 148
            Structure and Functions........................................ 148
            Background............................................................ 148
            UNITAR in 1987.................................................... 149
    Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms........................... 151
        Situation of Human Rights and
            Fundamental Freedoms in Cuba.......................... 151
        Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance......... 153
        Human Rights in the Occupied Territories
            of the Middle East................................................ 153
        Racial Discrimination in Southern Africa....................... 154
        Self-Determination........................................................... 156
        Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights............................ 158
        Human Rights of Persons Subjected to Detention
            or Imprisonment.................................................. 159

Drafting of International Human Rights Instruments... 160
    Rights of the Child 161
    Human Rights of Migrant Workers 161
    Rights of Minorities 162
    Human Rights Defenders 162
    Youth and Human Rights 162
Review of the Work of the Subcommission on Minorities 163
Violations of Human Rights 163
Human Rights in Chile 167
Advisory Services 167
Measures Against Totalitarian and Other Ideologies and Practices Based on Terror or Incitement to Racial Discrimination 168
Status of the International Covenants on Human Rights 168
Regional Arrangements 169
Science and Technology 169
Status of Women 170
    Commission on the Status of Women 171
    Economic and Social Council Consideration 174
    General Assembly Consideration 174
Specialized Agencies and the IAEA 175
    World Bank Group 175
        IDA and IBRD Lending Program 175
        International Finance Corporation (IFC) 177
    International Monetary Fund (IMF) 177
    International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) 179
    Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) 181
        FAO Council 182
        FAO Conference 183
        Other Conference Issues 184
        Other Meetings 185
        The World Food Program (WFP) 185
            The Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programs (CFA) 186
    UN Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) 188
        UNESCO Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export, and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property 190
        Universal Copyright Convention 190
        Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission.. 191
        International Geological Correlation Program 191
        Man and the Biosphere Program (MAB) 193
        World Heritage Committee 194

U.S. National Commission for UNESCO ............... 194
World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) ........ 195
  Administrative Organization ............................... 195
  Technical Activities ........................................ 196
  Assistance to Developing Countries ....................... 196
  Revision of the Paris Convention .......................... 196
  Patent Cooperation Treaty .................................. 197
  Brussels Satellite Convention ............................. 197
World Health Organization (WHO) ............................ 197
  U.S. Participation ............................................. 197
  Health Issues .................................................. 198
    AIDS ............................................................ 199
    Pharmaceuticals .............................................. 199
    Smoking ......................................................... 200
    Health Care Financing ...................................... 201
    Diarrheal Diseases .......................................... 201
    Advancing Health for All .................................. 201
    Research on the Aging ...................................... 201
    Maternal Health ............................................. 202
    Other Health Topics ......................................... 202
  Administrative and Budgetary Issues ...................... 202
    WHO Leadership ............................................. 202
    U.S. Government Payments ................................. 202
    WHO 1988-1989 Program Budget ......................... 204
    Budget Reform ................................................ 206
  Political Issues ................................................ 207
    New Assembly Rules ........................................ 207
    Action Regarding Israel .................................... 207
    Health Effects of Nuclear War ............................ 208
    Embargoes on Medical Supplies ........................... 208
    African Issues ................................................ 209
    Chemical War ................................................. 209
  Pan American Health Organization (PAHO) ........ 209
  International Agency for Research on Cancer ............................................ 210
International Maritime Organization (IMO) ................... 211
  Assembly ........................................................ 211
  Council ........................................................... 211
  Maritime Safety Committee ................................... 212
  Legal Committee ............................................... 212
  Marine Environment Protection Committee ........ 213
International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) ........ 214
  Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against Civil Aviation ............................................ 214
  ICAO Council .................................................. 215
  ICAO Panels ................................................... 216
International Telecommunication Union (ITU) ............. 216
  Administrative Council ....................................... 217

Center for Telecommunications Development ..... 219
Plenipotentiary Conference Planning..................... 220
ITU Technical Bodies........................................... 220
International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee (CCITT)........ 220
International Radio Consultative Committee (CCIR)................................ 221
International Frequency Registration Board (IFRB)........................................... 222
Universal Postal Union (UPU) ........................................... 222
Executive Council.................................................... 222
Consultative Council for Postal Studies................. 222
International Labor Organization (ILO) ......................... 223
Governing Body........................................................ 223
Financial Problems........................................... 223
Budget Reform ................................................. 224
ILO Annual Conference............................................ 224
1988-1989 Budget ................................................ 224
Technical Agenda Items.................................. 225
Additional Resolutions .................................... 225
Other Political Issues....................................... 226
High-Level Meeting on Employment and Structural Adjustment .................. 226
U.S. Action on ILO Conventions............................ 227
World Meteorological Organization (WMO) ................. 227
Organization............................................................. 228
WMO Congress......................................................... 228
Major Program Activities ........................................ 228
World Weather Watch....................................... 228
World Climate Program................................... 229
Hydrology and Water Resources Program .. 229
Research and Development............................ 229
Technical Cooperation..................................... 230
Budgetary and Financial Matters........................... 230
Voluntary Cooperation Program............................ 231
Elections and Appointments .................................. 231
International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)................ 232
Board of Governors................................................ 233
1987 General Conference........................................ 234
IAEA Programs........................................................ 236
Safeguards......................................................... 236
Technical Cooperation..................................... 236
Nuclear Safety .................................................. 237
General Assembly ................................................... 238

PART 3. TRUSTEESHIP AND DEPENDENT AREAS

Introduction.......................................................................... 240
Special Committee (Committee of 24) .................................. 241

- Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (TTPI) 242
  - Trusteeship Council Consideration 244
- U.S. Territories 245
  - Special Committee Consideration 245
  - American Samoa 245
  - Guam 246
  - U.S. Virgin Islands 246
  - General Assembly Action 247
- Namibia 248
  - Security Council Consideration 248
  - General Assembly Consideration 250
- Puerto Rico 253
- Western Sahara 254
- New Caledonia 255
- Other Questions 256
  - Fourth Committee Resolutions 256
  - Plenary Action 257

PART 4. LEGAL DEVELOPMENTS

- Introduction 258
- International Terrorism 258
- International Court of Justice (ICJ) 260
  - Nicaragua v. United States of America 261
  - Case Concerning Elettronica Sicula, S.p.A. (ELSI) United States v. Italy 261
- International Law Commission (ILC) 261
  - Work of the Commission's 38th Session 262
  - General Assembly Action 263
- UN Commission on International Trade Law 264
  - Work of the Commission's 20th Session 264
  - General Assembly Action 265
- Draft Code of Offenses Against the Peace and Security of Mankind 266
- Non-Use of Force in International Organizations 267
  - Special Committee 267
  - General Assembly 268
- Protection of Diplomats 268
- International Convention Against Mercenary Activities 269
- Strengthening International Security 269
- Host Country Relations 273
- Protection of Persons Under Detention or Imprisonment 275
- Development of Principles Concerning International Economic Relations 276

PART 5. BUDGET, ADMINISTRATION, AND INSTITUTIONAL MANAGEMENT

Introduction ..... 278
UN Reform ..... 281
Current Financial Crisis of the UN ..... 283
UN Budget ..... 286
Audit Reports ..... 288
Financing of Assessed Peacekeeping Operations ..... 290
Scales of Assessment ..... 291
Committee for Program and Coordination (CPC) ..... 293
  The Proposed UN Program Budget for 1988-1989 ..... 294
  Medium-Term Plan ..... 295
  Program Performance for 1986–1987 ..... 295
  Review of Evaluation Activities ..... 297
  Cross Organizational Program Analyses ..... 298
Joint Inspection Unit (JIU) ..... 298
Committee on Conferences ..... 300
International Civil Service Commission (ICSC) ..... 303
Personnel Questions ..... 304
  Composition of the Secretariat ..... 304
  Staff-Management Relations ..... 305
  Other Questions ..... 307
UN Pension System ..... 307
Employment of Americans ..... 308

APPENDICES

Address by President Reagan at the 42nd Regular Session of the General Assembly ..... 312
Principal Organs of the United Nations ..... 321
United States Missions ..... 328
United States Representatives ..... 330
Scale of Assessments for the Apportionment of the Expenses of the United Nations ..... 339

## Acronyms and Short Forms

| | |
|---|---|
| AID | U.S. Agency for International Development |
| ACABQ | Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions |
| ACC | Administrative Committee on Coordination |
| Committee of 24 | Special Committee on the Situation with Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration of the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples |
| CD | Conference on Disarmament |
| CSCE | Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe |
| EC | European Community |
| ECA | Economic Commission for Africa |
| ECE | Economic Commission for Europe |
| ECLAC | Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean |
| ECOSOC | Economic and Social Council |
| ESCAP | Economic and Social Commission for Asia ...and the Pacific |
| ESCWA | Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia |
| FAO | Food and Agriculture Organization |
| GATT | General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade |
| G-77 | Group of 77 |
| HHS | U.S. Department of Health and Human Services |
| IAEA | International Atomic Energy Agency |
| IBRD | International Bank for Reconstruction and Development |
| ICAO | International Civil Aviation Organization |
| IDA | International Development Association |
| IFC | International Finance Corporation |
| ILO | International Labor Organization |
| IMO | International Maritime Organization |
| IMF | International Monetary Fund |
| ITU | International Telecommunication Union |
| NASA | U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration |
| NATO | North Atlantic Treaty Organization |
| OAS | Organization of American States |
| OAU | Organization of African Unity |
| OECD | Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development |
| OPEC | Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries |
| PLO | Palestine Liberation Organization |
| SWAPO | South West Africa People's Organization |
| UNCITRAL | UN Commission of International Trade Law |

| | |
|---|---|
| UNCTAD | UN Conference on Trade and Development |
| UNDC | UN Disarmament Commission |
| UNDOF | UN Disengagement Observer Force |
| UNDP | UN Development Program |
| UNEF | UN Emergency Force |
| UNEP | UN Environment Program |
| UNESCO | UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization |
| UNFICYP | UN Force in Cyprus |
| UNHCR | Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees |
| UNICEF | UN Children's Fund |
| UNIDO | UN Industrial Development Organization |
| UNIFIL | UN Interim Force in Lebanon |
| UNITAR | UN Institute for Training and Research |
| UNRWA | UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East |
| UNSCEAR | UN Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation |
| UPU | Universal Postal Union |
| WFP | World Food Program |
| WHO | World Health Organization |
| WIPO | World Intellectual Property Organization |
| WMO | World Meteorological Organization |

## Part 1

# Political and Security Affairs

Since the United Nations was founded in 1945, its main purpose has been the promotion of international peace and security. This remains the centerpiece of the UN system.

## SECURITY COUNCIL

The Charter gives the Security Council and the General Assembly authority to consider threats to the peace. Primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security rests with the Security Council. The Charter authorizes the Council to act to achieve peaceful settlement of disputes (Chapter VI) and to deal with threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression (Chapter VII). The Council can only make recommendations for actions on matters raised under Chapter VI. In areas covered by Chapter VII, however, it may take decision—including imposition of collective political, economic and military sanctions —which, in theory at least, are binding on all member States.

The 15-member Council functions continuously, meeting as necessary. The Charter gives a special role to the five Permanent Members—China, France, U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom, and the United States. A negative vote by a Permanent Member constitutes a veto of any substantive Council action, in the event that such action (usually a draft resolution) receives at least nine positive votes. Council decisions on procedural matters require nine or more positive votes for adoption. They cannot be vetoed, but in these cases the Council usually operates by consensus.

The other 10 members are elected by the General Assembly; by tradition they represent regional blocs. The 10 members serve overlapping 2-year terms; 5 members are elected each year. The countries finishing their term of membership in 1987 were: Bulgaria, Congo, Ghana, United Arab Emirates, and Venezuela. The 5 members for the 1987–1988 term are: Argentina, Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, and Zambia; for the 1988–1989 term: Algeria, Brazil, Nepal, Senegal, and Yugoslavia.

The Council has created several UN peacekeeping and peace-monitoring operations to help carry out its responsibilities. Five such units existed in 1987: the UN Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP); the UN Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) in the Golan Heights between Israel and Syria; the UN Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) stationed in southern Lebanon; the UN Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO), located in Israel and other Mideast countries; and the UN Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP). These operations were launched and deployed with the consent of the Council and the governments directly concerned; that consent remains the basis for their existence. In 1978 the Council also authorized creation of a UN Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) to help the Special Representative of the Secretary General ensure the early independence of Namibia through free and fair elections. Though composition of UNTAG has been agreed upon, its formation awaits final agreement on a Namibia settlement in accordance with Security Council resolution 435 (1978).

The Security Council held 49 meetings in 1987, compared to 91 in 1986. Most of these meetings concerned the Middle East and southern Africa. The Council passed 13 resolutions in 1987 (1986 total: also 13); 11 were adopted unanimously. The United States voted for 11 of these resolutions and abstained on 2. In terms of peacekeeping forces, the Council passed resolutions which renewed UNIFIL twice (January 15, July 31), UNDOF twice (May 29, November 25), and UNFICYP twice (June 12, December 14). The United States supported all extensions of these mandates. Neither UNTSO nor UNMOGIP requires periodic renewal by the Council.

Four vetoes were cast in the Council in 1987. Two of these were by the United States: one on South Africa and one on Namibia. The United Kingdom joined the United States in vetoing both of these resolutions.

The Council convened 26 times on African issues, 13 involving complaints against South Africa and 13 involving Namibia. The Council adopted two resolutions on South Africa. The meetings on Namibia considered two resolutions. The United States and the United Kingdom vetoed one of these; the United States abstained on the other. The Council President issued two statements on South Africa: one concerning detention without trial and another calling for the commutation of the death sentences of six Black South Africans convicted of murder in connection with politically-related violence.

Security Council consideration of the Iran-Iraq war centered on adoption of a resolution calling for a cease-fire and the withdrawal of forces to internationally recognized borders without delay as a first step toward a negotiated settlement. The United States strongly supported this resolution. On other Middle Eastern issues, the Council focused on the situation in the Israeli-occupied territories of the West Bank and Gaza. The Council adopted a resolution that "strongly deplored" the policies of Israel in the occupied territories; it also called upon Israel to abide by the Geneva Convention relating to the protection of civilian persons in time of war and to desist from all practices in violation of that convention. The United States abstained on this resolution.

## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Except for the anomalous situation of the Delegation of South Africa, whose credentials have not been accepted since 1970, all UN member states are currently represented in the General Assembly. The Assembly meets annually from mid-September to late December. After 3 weeks of general debate, the work of the Assembly takes place in seven main committees of the plenary. Political issues are handled in several forums: arms control and disarmament in the First Committee, broad political issues in the Special Political Committee and the plenary, human rights in the Third Committee, and the dependent territories and decolonization questions in the Fourth Committee.

The 42nd General Assembly convened on September 15, and was suspended on December 21. President Reagan addressed the plenary on September 21, the fifth year in a row that he has spoken to the fall session of the General Assembly. Of the 351 resolutions and decisions adopted by the Assembly during its 42nd session, the United States joined consensus on 176, abstained on 42, did not participate on 3, and cast yes or no votes on 130. The Assembly decided 175 issues by vote.

A major goal of the United States at the 42nd General Assembly was to combat the practice of name-calling, i.e., gratuitous criticism of the United States by name in Assembly resolutions. Through a combination of intensive lobbying by the United States and a change in tactics on the part of the sponsors of the relevant resolutions, instances of name-calling sharply declined in the 42nd General Assembly (compared to the 41st, when 15 such references appeared in the original drafts of resolutions on the Middle East and southern Africa, and three were retained in adoption). In the 42nd General Assembly the draft resolutions on Namibia contained no criticism of the United States, in contrast to 10 name-calling references the previous year. One draft resolution on Apartheid in South Africa and one on the Middle East each contained an instance of name-calling. The United States called for separate paragraph votes to delete these references, but this effort was unsuccessful and they remained in the resolutions as adopted.

Middle Eastern and southern African issues did not dominate the political agenda of the 42nd General Assembly to the same degree that they had in previous years. Afghanistan, Cambodia, and the Soviet proposal for a Comprehensive System of International Peace and Security (CSIS) proved to be major issues.

On items concerning Cambodia and Afghanistan, the United States joined record General Assembly majorities in adopting resolutions seeking to end Vietnam's occupation of Cambodia and the Soviet Union's occupation of Afghanistan. In 1987 there was no challenge to the credentials of Democratic Kampuchea.

The United States voted against the Soviet-sponsored resolution on CSIS because the initiative represented an effort to undermine the UN Charter. Although the CSIS resolution was adopted, less than half of the General Assembly members cast their vote in support of it. This represented a substantial setback to the Soviet initiative, which had been adopted by a significant majority in 1986.

The United States supported the plenary decision to reject by a record margin the challenge to Israeli credentials. There was no plenary discussion about Puerto Rico or Micronesia. The body of disarmament resolutions was mixed, but the United States was pleased with the adoption by consensus of resolutions it promoted on investigation of chemical-weapons use and on the importance of complying with arms control agreements. Consideration of Antarctica failed to restore the consensus practice that had prevailed for several years before breaking down in 1985. Joined by many countries from all regional groups, the United States declined to participate in voting on the two Antarctic resolutions, whose effect, if not their intent, would be to undermine the Antarctic Treaty system.

The United States voted against two resolutions related to U.S. policy regarding Nicaragua, both of which passed, but joined consensus on the resolution on peace in Central America. The United States cosponsored the consensus resolution on cooperation between the Organization of American States and the United Nations. It also supported successful resolutions on the Falklands (Malvinas) issue and cooperation between the United Nations and the Latin American economic system.

On the Middle East, the Assembly adopted by large margins 20 resolutions: 4 dealing with the general situation in the region, 6 on the question of Palestine, 7 on Israeli practices in the occupied territories, and 1 each on cooperation between the UN and the Arab League, Israeli nuclear armament, and the establishment of a nuclear-weapons-free zone in the Middle East. With the exception of the resolution on a nuclear-weapons-free zone, on which it joined consensus, the United States voted against or abstained on all resolutions, chiefly because their lack of balance and strident tone did not promote the quest for a just and lasting peace in the region.

The Assembly also adopted 11 resolutions on UNRWA, the UN relief operation for Palestinian refugees in the Middle East. The United States cosponsored one of these texts, which expressed concern for the continued plight of the Palestinian refugees and called for increased contributions to the UNRWA and also for the return of UNRWA Headquarters from Vienna to the

Middle East as soon as practicable. In all, the United States voted for two of the texts, joined consensus on two others, and voted "no" on the other UNRWA resolutions.

The Assembly adopted 13 resolutions on southern Africa, 8 under the item "Policies of Apartheid of the Government of South Africa" and 5 under the item "Question of Namibia." While restating firm opposition to Apartheid in any form, the United States voted against seven of these resolutions because of their extreme confrontational tone. It joined the consensus in favor of the eighth resolution on Apartheid. In line with its standard practice as a member of the Namibia Contact Group, the United States abstained on the five resolutions involving Namibia.

In the Fourth Committee, the United States achieved its objectives of blocking any General Assembly initiatives on Puerto Rico or Micronesia. The Committee and the plenary approved noncontentious resolutions on American Samoa, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and Guam.

Arms control, disarmament, and international security matters once again generated the largest number of resolutions in the 42nd General Assembly. The First Committee handled most of this work, examining 68 resolutions, all of which were adopted in plenary. The United States participated actively in these deliberations, mobilizing support successfully for its initiatives on chemical-weapons use and compliance with international agreements.

## PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT

### Middle East

#### SECURITY COUNCIL CONSIDERATION

#### Situation in the Occupied Territories

The Security Council dealt with the situation in the Israeli-occupied territories of the West Bank and Gaza only once in 1987. In December 1987 serious clashes occurred between demonstrators in Gaza and Israeli security forces which soon spread to the West Bank. Use of live fire by Israeli security forces left a number of Palestinians killed and wounded. Pressure built within a few days in the Security Council to call upon Israel to halt the use of live fire against demonstrators and to abide by the Fourth Geneva Convention on the protection of civilian persons in time of war. On December 17 the non-aligned members of the Council submitted a draft resolution. After several days of formal debate and informal consultations, the resolution was adopted on December 22 by a vote of 14 to 0, with 1 abstention (U.S.). (Resolution 605.) Security Council resolution 605 strongly deplored Israeli policies and practices which violate Palestinian human rights, particularly the opening of fire by the Israeli army resulting in killing and wounding of defenseless civilians. It reaffirmed the applicability of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War to the occupied territories, and called upon Israel to immediately abide by the Convention. The resolution also called for the exercise of maximum restraint by all parties, stressed the need to reach a just and durable settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict, and requested the Secretary General to submit a report on the situation in the occupied territories by January 20, 1988.

In our explanation of vote, Ambassador Herbert Okun noted U.S. concern over the violence in the territories and the loss of life and large number of wounded, and our awareness of the toll that the 40-year-old state of war and 21 years of occupation had taken on both Palestinians and Israelis. The demonstrations, he added, were "spontaneous expressions of frustration and not externally sponsored." He stated that "This latest eruption of violent confrontation is a forceful reminder . . . of the unresolved political status of the West Bank and Gaza as well as of the deep frustration of the Palestinian people whose daily lives are so profoundly affected." The United States abstained on the resolution, however, because it went beyond deploring the use of live fire "to a generalized criticism of Israeli policies and practices . . . The resolution ignores the fact that Israeli lives are also at risk." Okun went on to say that "the challenge before all members of the Council is how to assist in the search for a mutually acceptable political settlement of the Arab-Israel conflict that will enable Israelis and Palestinians, and indeed people throughout the region, to live in peace and security."

### Lebanon

The only Security Council action on Lebanon in 1987 was the issuance on March 19 of a statement by the President of the Security Council on behalf of the members.

The statement noted with profound concern that the Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon had not received the necessary humanitarian assistance and that the situation in those camps remained critical.

The Presidential statement expressed alarm at the suffering of the civilian population in the camps, and reiterated the need for all concerned parties to facilitate the efforts of various UN agencies, particularly the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestinian Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA), to deliver food and medical supplies.

On behalf of the Council, the President called for a speedy end to violence in and around the Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon, a return to a situation of normality, and the safeguarding of civilian lives.

### UN Interim Force in Lebanon

The Security Council discussed the peace-keeping functions of the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) on two occasions in 1987, in both instances, just before the 6-month UNIFIL mandate expired.

**UNIFIL Renewal, January 15.** The Security Council unanimously renewed the UNIFIL mandate for another 6-month period ending July 31, 1987. (Resolution 594.) Ambassador Okun used this opportunity to reiterate our support for the UNIFIL operation, saying that, "While we believe that the best means to bring permanent stability to southern Lebanon and assure security along the Israeli-Lebanese border are agreed upon, long-term security arrangements, in the interim there appears no real alternative to UNIFIL."

**UNIFIL Renewal, July 31.** The Security Council unanimously renewed UNIFIL's mandate with resolution 599.

### UN Disengagement Observer Force

Continuing the routine procedure of previous years, the Security Council unanimously renewed the 6-month mandate for the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) without debate on the two occasions that the issue came up in 1987. This peacekeeping force operates on the Golan Heights between Israeli and Syrian forces.

**UNDOF Renewal, May 29.** The Council unanimously adopted a resolution extending the mandate for 6 months. (Resolution 596.) The resolution was identical in form and language to the UNDOF resolutions of recent years. Also identical to past practice was a statement delivered after the vote by the President of the Council, which endorsed a comment in the Secretary General's latest UNDOF report—a comment regularly included in these reports—calling the situation in the Middle East "potentially dangerous," as long as a comprehensive Middle East settlement is not reached.

**UNDOF Renewal, November 25.** The Security Council followed exactly the same procedure as before (see above) to renew the mandate for another 6 months. (Resolution 603.) The text of the resolution did not differ except for updating references from earlier UNDOF renewal resolutions, and the vote was again unanimous.

## GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION

### Israeli Credentials

As in the past several years, there was a challenge to Israeli credentials at the 42nd General Assembly by the Arab group, this time led by Libya. On

October 13 the Arab Group moved that the routine resolution before the plenary, which accepted the report of the Credentials Committee, be amended by adding the words "except with regard to the credentials of Israel." The Finnish Representative, speaking on behalf of the five Nordic countries, moved formally under Rule 74 of the General Assembly's rules of procedure that action be deferred on the Arab amendment. (This motion repeated Nordic actions of the previous 5 years on this issue.) Immediately put to a vote, the Nordic motion was adopted 80 (U.S.) to 39, with 10 abstentions. Support for the motion to defer action on Israeli credentials was greater in the 42nd General Assembly than in any previous session. Having thus disposed of this challenge, the Assembly adopted the first report of the Credentials Committee without a vote. (Resolution 42/2 A.)

**Situation in the Middle East**

The General Assembly debated the annually recurring agenda item, "The Situation in the Middle East" in two plenary sessions on December 1 and 2. On December 11 the four draft resolutions submitted under this topic were adopted. The United States voted against three of them and abstained on one.

The first draft resolution, A/42/L.41, was sponsored by 14 Arab states. It took note of the growing international consensus in favor of an international peace conference to resolve the Arab-Israeli conflict, stated that its core was the Palestinian question, and reaffirmed that such a conference should be convened under the auspices of the United Nations with the participation of the five Permanent Members of the Security Council and all the parties to the conflict, including the Palestine Liberation Organization, as the "sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people." It requested the Secretary General, in consultation with the Security Council, to continue efforts to convene the conference and report back to the Assembly by September 1988. The text was adopted by a vote of 124 to 3 (U.S.), with 22 abstentions. Honduras and Israel joined the United States in voting against the resolution. (Resolution 42/209 A.)

Nineteen non-aligned and Arab states introduced the second draft resolution (A/42/L.42). In its 15 operative paragraphs, it reaffirmed a large number of previous General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, reiterated support for the Palestine Liberation Organization as the "sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people," and called for an International Peace Conference on the Middle East under UN auspices to "contribute to the promotion of peace in the region." It called for the complete and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from the territories occupied in 1967, including Jerusalem, for self-determination for the Palestinian people, and the establishment of an "independent sovereign state in Palestine." The draft resolution stated that all parties, including the PLO, must participate in a settlement on an equal footing, and deplored Israel's failure to comply with relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, as well as its annexation of Jerusalem. The text also declared the Arab Peace Plan adopted at Fez, Morocco, as an "important contribution" to the achievement of a just and lasting peace. It condemned Israel's continued occupation of the territories and reaffirmed the applicability of the Geneva Convention relating to the protection of civilians in time of war to all the occupied territories, including Jerusalem. The resolution condemned Israeli policies such as expropriation, and expansion of settlements. It also condemned Israel's annexation of the Golan Heights and the U.S.-Israeli agreements on strategic cooperation and trade. The resolution called upon all states to try to refrain from supplying Israel with military, economic, financial, and technical aid, and condemned "increasing collaboration between Israeli and the racist regime of South Africa." The resolution concluded with a request to the Secretary General to report periodically to the Security Council on the situation and submit a comprehensive report to the 43rd General Assembly. The vote was 99 to 19 (U.S.) with 33 abstentions. Fifteen Western nations, two Latin American states, and Israel joined the United States in opposition. (Resolution 42/209 B.)

The third draft resolution (A/42/L.43), sponsored by 23 Arab and non-aligned states, dealt with the Israeli-occupied Syrian Golan Heights and also condemned Israel's "record, policies, and actions" as not being those of "a peace-loving state." It called upon all member states not to supply and refrain from acquiring weapons or military equipment from Israel, to suspend economic, financial, and technological assistance to Israel, and to sever diplomatic, trade, and cultural relations. The vote was 82 to 23 (U.S.), with 43 abstentions. (Resolution 42/209 C.) Many Western nations, Japan and Israel, and two Latin American states were opposed, along with the United States.

The fourth draft resolution (A/42/L.44) sponsored by 23 Arab and non-aligned states, focused on the status of Jerusalem. Its operative paragraphs declared Israel's annexation of the city "null and void," deplored the transfer of diplomatic missions to Jerusalem by some states, and called upon the latter to abide by relevant provisions of UN resolutions, and requested the Secretary General to report to the 43rd General Assembly on implementation of this resolution. It was adopted by a vote of 140 to 3, with 7 abstentions (U.S.), (Resolution 42/209 D.)

The Honorable Mark Siljander, Alternate U.S. Representative to the 42nd General Assembly, stated that the United States had voted against A/42/L.41 because " it did not address the criteria necessary to make concrete progress toward peace . . . it makes no mention of bilateral or direct negotiations. It subsumes the universally accepted bases of negotiation—Security Council resolutions 242 and 338—under an ambiguous umbrella formulation." He said that the United States had opposed A/42/L.42 because it was "polemical and condemnatory in tone, including with regard to United States relations with another member state."* Siljander explained that we had voted against A/42/L.43 because it was "unbalanced and harmful." Regarding A/42/L.44, Siljander declared that we had abstained, because "we believe that the status of Jerusalem should be determined by means of negotiations among the parties concerned and as part of an overall peace settlement."

**Question of Palestine**

In plenary meetings between November 22 and 25, the General Assembly considered the agenda item entitled "Question of Palestine," a topic carried over from previous years. Four draft resolutions were introduced on December 2, sponsored by 16 states, mostly non-aligned. They were all adopted over negative votes by the United States.

The first resolution endorsed the efforts of the General Assembly's Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People, a body that the United States has consistently opposed as serving the partisan political aims of the Palestine Liberation Organization. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 131 to 2 (U.S.), with 22 abstentions. (Resolution 42/66 A.)

The second resolution dealt mainly with the Secretariat's Division for Palestinian Rights, another body opposed by the United States on grounds of partisanship toward the Palestine Liberation Organization. This text, expressing appreciation and support for the Division's work, was adopted by a vote of 133 to 3 (U.S.), with 20 abstentions. (Resolution 42/66 B.)

The third text mandated the Secretariat's Department of Public Information to cooperate with the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People in various publicity activities relating to Palestine, including the issuance of material "on Israel's violation of the human rights of the Arab inhabitants of the occupied territories." It was adopted by a vote of 133 to 3 (U.S.), with 18 abstentions. (Resolution 42/66 C.)

The fourth resolution dealt exclusively with the proposal to convene an international peace conference on the Middle East under UN auspices. It endorsed the proposal and reiterated the call for a preparatory committee to take the necessary action to convene the Conference. The United States lobbied against this text in New York and in the capitals of various countries. The resolution was nevertheless adopted by a vote of 129 to 2 (U.S.), with 24 abstentions. This represents another increase of votes in favor of the resolution over the previous year, mainly attributable to the deletion of name-calling references to the United States and Israel, which made the resolution more palatable to a number of delegates. (Resolution 42/66.D.)

Speaking before the vote on December 2, Ambassador Boeker said that the United States had to vote against resolutions 42/66 A, B, and C because they "perpetuate bodies and activities, created by the General Assembly which are dedicated to expounding only the Palestinian perspective." He said that "While the United States supports legitimate Palestinian rights, it regrets this body's steps to institutionalize a one-sided perspective. Such steps are sadly inconsistent with the effort to put forward the United Nations as a sponsor of a conference to launch negotiations."

Ambassador Boeker stated that the United States could not support resolution 42/66 D because it "reveals a one-sided approach which will not advance prospects for reaching an agreed formula for negotiations." He concluded by saying that "my government will persist in its efforts to help the parties find a formula for such negotiations. Let us not make the way forward harder and more tortuous, nor depreciate the UN's original contribution of framing the most widely accepted basis for settling the conflict."

### Israeli Practices in Occupied Territories

As in previous years, the Special Political Committee of the General Assembly was assigned the annually recurring agenda item entitled "Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories." Debate took place in six sessions of the Special Political Committee between November 18 and November 20 and between November 23 and 25. At the close of these sessions seven draft resolutions were approved and forwarded to the plenary with a recommendation that they be adopted. All were sponsored by the same group of 12 states, excepting the fourth, which did not include Egypt as a cosponsor.

The first draft resolution, on the subject of prisoners held by Israel who were "arbitrarily detained and/or imprisoned as a result of their struggle for self-determination," was sponsored by the 12 states. The resolution demanded the immediate release of these prisoners, and was approved by 89 to 2 (U.S.), with 29 abstentions.

Another draft resolution reaffirmed the applicability of the Fourth Geneva Convention to the territories occupied by Israel since 1967, and condemned Israel's unwillingness to acknowledge its applicability. The United States requested a separate vote on the operative paragraph that merely affirmed the Convention's applicability, and voted in favor of that paragraph. It was approved by a vote of 122 (U.S.) to 1, with no abstentions. The draft as a whole was approved by a vote of 116 to 1, with 5 abstentions (U.S.). Israel voted against both resolutions.

A third draft resolution deploring Israeli actions "designed to change the legal status, geographical nature, and demographic composition" of the occupied territories, especially Israel's settlements policy, was approved by a vote of 118 to 1, with 5 abstentions (U.S).

The next draft resolution condemned a large number of alleged policies and practices of Israel in the occupied territories. Citing the Fourth Geneva Convention, the draft declared in its sixth operative paragraph "that Israel's grave breaches of that Convention are war crimes and an affront to humanity." A separate vote on the sixth operative paragraph upheld that language by 78 to 21 (U.S), with 23 abstentions. Many Western states joined the United States and Israel in opposing this unbalanced and offensive provision. There was also a separate vote on paragraph 22 of this resolution that called upon Israel to reopen a Roman Catholic hospice in East Jerusalem which it had closed for reasons of sanitation. This paragraph was adopted 120 to 2 (U.S.), with 2 abstentions. The draft resolution as a whole was then approved 95 to 2 (U.S.), with 27 abstentions.

Another draft resolution once again demanded that Israel rescind its 1980 measures expelling the mayors of Hebron and Nablus and contained a paragraph condemning Israel for "its persistent refusal to comply with the relevant UN Security Council and UN General Assembly resolutions." This paragraph was adopted by a separate vote of 96 to 2 (U.S.), with 25 abstentions. The resolution as a whole passed 108 to 1, with 16 abstentions (U.S.).

The sixth draft resolution dealt with the Golan Heights. It declared, *inter alia*, that Israel's measures which "purport to alter the character and legal status of the Syrian Golan Heights are null and void and constitute a flagrant violation of international law." This draft was approved 118 to 1, with 6 abstentions (U.S.).

The final draft resolution condemned alleged Israeli practices and policies against Palestinian students and educational institutions, including what it called "the policy of opening fire on defenseless students, causing many casualties" This paragraph was adopted by a separate vote of 111 to 2 (U.S.), with 11 abstentions.

The above seven draft resolutions were considered by the full General Assembly on December 8, and were all adopted on that date. The specific votes were as follows:

— The resolution on release of political prisoners was adopted by a vote of 111 to 2 (U.S.), with 36 abstentions. (Resolution 42/160 A.)

— The resolution on the Fourth Geneva Convention was adopted by 142 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions (U.S.). (Resolution 42/160 B.) Immediately before this vote, the United States repeated the request it had made in the Special Political Committee for a separate vote on the provision that merely affirmed the Convention's applicability to the occupied territories. This provision was again upheld 122 (U.S.) to 1.

— The resolution on Israel's settlements policy and similar activities was adopted by a vote of 143 to 1, with 8 abstentions (U.S.). (Resolution 42/160 C.)

— The resolution condemning a large number of alleged policies and practices of Israel was approved by 112 to 3 (U.S.), with 38 abstentions.

(Resolution 42/160 D.) Immediately before this vote, a separate vote was again taken on the tendentious sixth operative paragraph (Israel's war crimes), and the Special Political Committee's earlier endorsement of this language was upheld by 78 to 21 (U.S.), with 23 abstentions.

— The resolution on the expulsion of the Palestinian notables passed by a vote of 130 to 1, with 23 abstentions (U.S.) (Resolution 42/160 E). A separate vote was again held on the paragraph criticizing Israel for failure to comply with previous resolutions; it passed by 96 to 2 (U.S.), with 25 abstentions.

— The resolution concerning the Golan Heights was adopted by 143 to 1, with 10 abstentions (U.S.). (Resolution 42/160 F.)

— The resolution condemning alleged oppression of Palestinian students and educational institutions was adopted by a vote of 137 to 2 (U.S.), with 14 abstentions. (Resolution 42/160 G.)

The U.S. Representative, Douglas Stevenson, speaking in the Special Political Committee following the voting on November 25, explained the U.S. position on the draft resolutions. He stated that the resolutions, as in the past, were one-sided and inflammatory and "can only delay the day when the parties to the conflict sit down together for the direct negotiations necessary for peace. As such, they serve no one's interest but those who believe they benefit by the continued suffering of the Palestinian people." He stressed that the United States had "worked too long and sacrificed too much in the search for a just and lasting peace . . . to support resolutions . . . which make the goal more difficult to achieve."

On specifics, Stevenson stated that the United States had:

— voted against the detention resolution because it "gives the totally unacceptable appearance of condoning violence, thus implicitly justifying those acts of terrorism which increasingly and tragically claim innocent victims in the region and throughout the world." He emphasized, however, that the United States continues to oppose the practice of administrative detention.

— abstained on the resolution on the Fourth Geneva Convention because "it is a prime example of a resolution which serves no purpose but to retard solution of the very problem which it claims to address." He noted, however, that as in the past we had supported the paragraph of the resolution reaffirming the applicability of the Convention to the territories occupied by Israel since 1967.

— abstained on the resolution on Israeli settlements because "it diverts efforts into unproductive legal debate and away from the real task of promoting peace through direct negotiations." He reiterated that the United States does not favor increased Israeli settlements in the occupied territories.

— voted against the resolution on Israeli policies and practices as "a one-sided and polemical resolution which can only inflame an already embittered situation and widen rather than narrow the differences between the parties."

— abstained on the resolution on the Palestinian notables "because it presents an unbalanced picture by not mentioning factors that contributed to the deportation of the individuals in question." Stevenson noted, however, that "the United States believes that the deportations were contrary to the Fourth Geneva Convention and that the deportees should be allowed to return."

— abstained on the Golan Heights resolution because it went beyond Security Council Resolution 497 of 1981, which the United States supports and which "declares the Israeli decision to impose its laws, jurisdiction, and administration in the Golan Heights null and void and without international legal effect."

— voted against the resolution on Palestinian students because "it condemns indiscriminately . . . without regard to facts or policies" and we must oppose its "inaccurate and inflammatory language which can only undermine genuine efforts to resolve disputes."

### Armed Israeli Action Against Iraqi Nuclear Installations

The General Assembly in plenary session on December 21 carried over from previous years an agenda item concerning the June 1981 Israeli raid on Iraq's nuclear reactor near Baghdad. The item, which had been considered by every session of the General Assembly from 1981 to 1986, resulted in passage of a resolution condemning Israel and calling for punitive actions against it by the international community. At the 42nd General Assembly, the item was not considered in Committee or plenary, since no resolution had been introduced by a member state. The item was retained on the agenda of the 42nd session, however, and can be discussed in a resumed session. In the absence of further action, the item will not be included on the agenda of the 43rd General Assembly unless there is a specific proposal by a member state to do so.

### Cooperation Between the United Nations and the League of Arab States

Libya introduced the traditional resolution in the General Assembly plenary on October 15 that encourages cooperation between the United Nations and the League of Arab States. As in the previous 3 years, the United States voted against the resolution, which passed by 153 to 2 (U.S.). (Resolution 42/5.) In a statement after the vote, U.S. Representative Okun stated that the United States had no choice but to vote against a resolution that requested the Secretary General to implement previous resolutions which are contrary to fundamental U.S. policies regarding the Middle East.

## UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA)

The UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) is mandated by the General Assembly to provide education, health, and relief services to Palestinian refugees in Lebanon, Jordan, and Syria, as well as, the West Bank and Gaza. These services meet basic human needs and provide some stability to the lives of the refugees. UNRWA's assistance is primarily to the young (school-age children), the aged, the disabled, and others who are unable to support themselves. The majority of Palestinians are self-sufficient and rely on UNRWA only for those services which they are denied by host governments or by the prohibitive cost of private sector substitutes. The United States is the largest single contributor to UNRWA.

The votes on UNRWA in the UN Special Political Committee on November 4, 1987, were similar to the votes in 1986. Eleven resolutions were presented, and all were adopted.

The first resolution, 42/69 A, sponsored by the United States, expressed support for the Agency and urged all nations to contribute generously. The Committee approved the resolution by a vote of 153 (U.S.), with 1 abstention (Israel).

Resolution 42/69 E, which demanded that Israel stop resettling Palestinian refugees in the Gaza Strip, was opposed by the United States for its condemnatory tone toward Israel. The resolution passed with a vote of 150 to 2 (U.S.), with 3 abstentions. The vote on resolution 42/69 F, which asked the Commissioner General to resume ration distribution to refugees, was adopted by a vote of 131 to 20 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions. The United States opposed the resolution because the real need for ration distribution had ended and its financing adversely affected other high priority UNRWA activities, such as education. The vote on resolution 42/69 G, which rejected any preconditions or restrictions on the return of refugees was opposed by the United States because of its oversimplistic and one-sided tone. The resolution was approved by a vote of 125 to 2 (U.S.), with 27 abstentions. Resolution 42/69 H, which dealt with the compensation of refugees for property owned in Israel passed 123 to 2 (U.S.), with 27 abstentions. The resolution was opposed by the United States because it prejudged issues of refugee repatriation and compensation which the United States believes should be settled through negotiation.

Resolution 42/69 I, concerning the protection of Palestinian refugees in the occupied territories, was adopted by a vote of 124 to 2 (U.S.), with 27 abstentions. Because the United States did not feel that the resolution could guarantee protection for both the refugees in the occupied territories and the Israeli Government, the United States voted against the resolution. The vote on resolution 42/69 J, which called on Israel to refrain from any action leading to the resettlement of Palestinian refugees in the West Bank was opposed by the United States because of its distorted description of Israeli proposals and its sweeping admonitions against any resettlement. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 145 to 2 (U.S.), with 7 abstentions. Finally, resolution 42/69 K, which called for the establishment of a proposed University of Jerusalem (Al-Quds) for Palestinian refugees, was adopted by a vote of 151 to 2 (U.S.), with 1 abstention. The United States felt the resolution was an unreasonable and unworkable approach to the higher education needs of the Palestinian refugees.

## Conflict Between Iran and Iraq

During 1987 Iran and Iraq continued their exchange of charges through letters to the Secretary General and Security Council, accusing each other of, *inter alia*, attacks on civilian areas and mistreatment of prisoners of war. Iran lodged a number of complaints against Iraq for violating the Geneva Convention ban on chemical weapons. Iran also sent letters complaining about U.S. naval activity in the Gulf.

The Security Council acted several times on the war, unanimously adopting a resolution demanding a negotiated end to the conflict and issuing a statement condemning Iraq's use of chemical weapons.

### SECURITY COUNCIL CONSIDERATION

### July Resolution

In January the five Permanent Members of the Council began consideration of a draft resolution, supplementing resolution 582 (1986), demanding an end to the war. After several months of negotiation, the Five reached agreement on a text in June and began formal consultations with other Council members. The Council voted unanimously on July 20 to adopt Security Council resolution 598. This was an unprecedented action; unlike earlier Council resolutions, 598 was adopted pursuant to Articles 39 and 40 of Chapter VII of the UN Charter and is thus mandatory under international law.

The key provision is the first operative paragraph, which "Demands that, as a first step toward a negotiated settlement, Iran and Iraq observe an immediate cease-fire, discontinue all military actions on land, at sea, and in the air, and withdraw all forces to the internationally recognized boundaries without delay." Resolution 598 also calls for an early exchange of prisoners and an international effort to assist in post-war reconstruction. It confers special responsibility on the Secretary General to help arrange for the cease-fire and withdrawal and to oversee implementation of the resolution's other provisions. It further requests that the Secretary General explore the question of establishing an impartial body to inquire into responsibility for the conflict.

Additionally, resolution 598 provides for consideration of further steps as necessary to ensure compliance by the parties.

In explanation of the U.S. vote, Secretary of State George Shultz appeared before the Security Council to express U.S. concern over continuation of the conflict and to emphasize our strong support for resolution 598. He noted:

> The resolution being adopted today represents a forceful action by the international community to bring about an immediate cease-fire and establish a framework for peace. Through this binding resolution, the international community seeks systematically to create the framework for an equitable and lasting peace, with neither victor nor vanquished, without loss of national territory by either of the combatants.

The official Iranian response to the adoption of resolution 598, delivered to the Secretary General on August 11, was quite negative. While not explicitly rejecting the resolution, Iran alleged that it reflected Iraq's formula for ending the conflict and Iran gave no indication of willingness to comply with its provisions. Iraq, on the other hand, welcomed the resolution and expressed willingness to comply in an August 14 letter to the Secretary General.

With the full support of the Security Council, Secretary General Perez de Cuellar traveled to the region in September to conduct a round of mediation talks in Tehran and Baghdad. In meetings with Iranian Prime Minister Musavi and Iraqi President Saddam Hussein, he presented the outline of a plan to implement resolution 598 as an integrated whole. The Secretary General had a subsequent round of talks in New York in December with Iranian Deputy Foreign Minister Larijani and Iraqi Deputy Prime Minister Tariq Aziz. At the conclusion of these meetings, the Secretary General reported to the Council on December 10, noting that considerable differences remained between the parties. Perez de Cuellar announced his conclusion that "at this moment a fresh and resolute impulse by the Council is needed."

On December 24 the Security Council President issued a statement, approved by all 15 members, in response to the Secretary General's report. The statement expressed "grave concern over the slow pace and lack of real progress" in the negotiations with the belligerents. The Council reaffirmed its "commitment to resolution 598 (1987) as an integrated whole" and stated that "implementation of that resolution is the only basis for a comprehensive, just, honorable, and durable settlement of the conflict." The statement reiterated support for the Secretary General's outline plan as endorsed by the Council. Most importantly, the members declared "their determination, in accordance with operative paragraph 10 of resolution 598 (1987), to consider further steps to ensure compliance with the resolution."

The United States, while fully supporting the mediation efforts of the Secretary General, urged that the Council proceed with consideration of a follow-on resolution to enforce resolution 598 through imposition of an arms embargo against Iran as the party not in compliance with 598. At year's end the United States was actively engaged in consultations with other Council members to achieve this objective.

### Chemical Weapons

At the request of the Secretary General, a team of experts visited Iran and Iraq in April–May to conduct an investigation into the alleged use of chemical weapons in the war. This was the fourth such mission, earlier investigations having been conducted in 1984, 1985, and 1986. The investigators' report concluded that Iraq had repeatedly used chemical weapons against Iranian forces, that civilians in Iran had been injured by chemical weapons, and that Iraqi military personnel had also been injured by chemical weapons. The experts did not find adequate evidence to support Iraq's charge that Iraqi casualties were caused by Iranian use of chemical weapons.

In his letter transmitting the report to the Security Council on May 8, the Secretary General expressed dismay at the group's conclusions and reiterated his views that "violation of the Geneva Protocol is one of the gravest infringements of international norms." The Secretary General reaffirmed that his paramount objective was bringing the war to an early end "through a comprehensive, just, and honorable settlement."

Following consultations of the Security Council, the Council President issued a statement May 14 on behalf of all the members. The Council strongly condemned the "repeated use of chemical weapons in open violation of the Geneva Protocol of 1925," while at the same time condemning "the prolongation of the conflict, which . . . continues to exact an appalling toll of human life, to cause heavy material damage in the two states, and to endanger peace and security in the region." The statement also expressed concern over possible extension of the conflict to other states in the region and reaffirmed Security Council resolution 582 (1986), which called for an end to hostilities and a negotiated settlement.

## GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION

The General Assembly carried over from previous years an agenda item on the "Consequences of the Prolongation of the Armed Conflict between Iran and Iraq." A resolution was adopted under this item in its first year of introduction by the 37th General Assembly, but no action has been taken in subsequent years. The 42nd General Assembly again decided not to take action but to retain the item on the agenda. If a resumed session of the 42nd General Assembly should occur, this item could be brought up for discussion.

## Afghanistan

The 42nd UN General Assembly passed by a record-breaking margin the resolution calling for a political solution to the Afghanistan problem, including the immediate withdrawal of foreign troops. This was the ninth session of the General Assembly, including an emergency session in January 1980, to adopt such a resolution following the 1979 Soviet invasion. Introduced by Pakistan and cosponsored by 48 other states, the resolution (42/15) was adopted on November 10 by a vote of 123 (U.S.) to 19, with 11 abstentions. The record number of affirmative votes was one vote more than that achieved for a similar resolution (41/33) in 1986.

The resolution, entitled "The Situation in Afghanistan and its Implications for International Peace and Security," was the same in substance as previous General Assembly resolutions on Afghanistan. Expressing grave concern "at the continuing foreign armed intervention in Afghanistan . . . and its serious implications for international peace and security," the resolution once again outlined four major elements for an Afghanistan settlement: (1) withdrawal of foreign troops; (2) restoration of an independent and non-aligned Afghanistan; (3) the right of self-determination for the Afghan people; and (4) the right of Afghan refugees to return in safety and honor.

The resolution also called on the Secretary General to continue to seek a political solution based on these principles. The UN Secretary General's "personal representative" for Afghanistan negotiations, Diego Cordovez, hosted two rounds, in February–March and September, of the indirect "proximity" talks between Pakistan and the Kabul regime at Geneva. Negotiations in 1987 continued to focus on the fourth instrument of a settlement, the question of a timetable for Soviet withdrawal, with a gradual narrowing of the gap between the two sides. Agreement on the other instrument—noninterference, return of refugees, and international guarantees—had been largely completed.

Ambassador Herbert S. Okun delivered a forceful statement on behalf of the U.S. Government at the 42nd General Assembly severely criticizing the continuing Soviet occupation and attempt to subjugate the Afghan people. He praised the 8-year resistance of "the heroic mujahidin" in their struggle against the numerically and technologically superior Soviet Army. Ambassador Okun further stated:

> Later today this body will vote overwhelmingly to request the Soviet Union to match its words with deeds. We will know true Soviet intentions when we meet a year from now. If at that time, Soviet troops remain on Afghan soil, the whole world will know that the Soviet Union's goal is not peace but conquest. If, however, the Soviet Union agrees to the elements of a fair and just settlement which are already on the table, the whole world will welcome its contribution to the establishment of a free, neutral, non-aligned, and peaceful Afghanistan.

## Cambodia

### CREDENTIALS AT THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The United Nations began dealing with the Cambodia issue in the wake of Vietnam's invasion of that country in 1978. This year represented the fifth consecutive year in which Hanoi chose not to challenge the credentials of Democratic Kampuchea (the coalition government of the Cambodian resistance) in the General Assembly. In earlier General Assemblies, Vietnam's challenge to the Democratic Kampuchea seat met with overwhelming defeat in the plenary. The report of the Credentials Committee, which accepted Democratic Kampuchea's credentials among others, was adopted in the Assembly by consensus on October 13.

### GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION

Since the Vietnamese invasion of Cambodia in December 1978, the General Assembly has nine times passed, by overwhelming majorities, resolutions calling for the withdrawal of all foreign forces, Cambodian self-determination, and aid to Khmer refugees. The resolution (42/3) was introduced at the 42nd General Assembly, as it has been every year, by members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) comprising Brunei, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand, and Singapore. The resolution, which had 60 cosponsors, was adopted on October 14 by a record-breaking vote of 117 (U.S.) to 21, with 16 abstentions. This represented two more affirmative votes than the 115 received for a similar resolution (41/6) in 1986.

The resolution, entitled "The Situation in Kampuchea (Cambodia)," called for the full implementation of the past eight resolutions on the subject and reiterated the conviction that ". . . the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Kampuchea, the restoration and preservation of its independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity, the right of the Kampuchean people to determine their own destiny and the commitment by all states to non-interference and nonintervention in the internal affairs of Kampuchea are the principal components of any just and lasting resolution of the Kampuchean problem." The resolution also took note, "with appreciation," of the report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of the International Conference on Kampuchea on its activities in 1986–1987 and requested "that the Committee continue its work, pending the reconvening of the conference."

Speaking for the United States on October 13, Ambassador Vernon A. Walters severely criticized Vietnam's continuing military occupation of Cambodia. He declared:

> On Christmas Day, 1978, Vietnamese forces poured across the border and a brutal period of Cambodian suffering entered a new phase. As Vietnam installed a puppet regime in Phnom Penh, hundreds of thousands of Cambodian refugees, weak with hunger

> and disease, fled into western Cambodia and Thailand to escape the advancing armies ... Today, almost 9 years later, the Cambodian people continue to suffer the presence of a Vietnamese occupation force of 140,000.

Ambassador Walters praised "the heroic effort" of thousands of Cambodian resistance fighters under the leadership of Prince Sihanouk "to force Vietnam to end its illegal occupation of Cambodia." Ambassador Walters then called upon Vietnam, in its own self-interest, to join efforts to bring an end to the Cambodian conflict:

> Vietnam, a nation at war for over 40 years, must understand that security in the modern world is not attained by conquering one's neighbor. Neither is debilitating warfare the key to national prosperity . . . Only after disengaging from Cambodia can Vietnam rejoin the international community and share.the many opportunities long enjoyed by other countries in the region.

Ambassador Walters also took note of the Soviet Union's responsibility with regard to Cambodia:

> Mr. President, it is also time to recognize the Soviet Union's responsibility in resolving the Cambodian tragedy. It seems disingenuous to claim a lack of influence in a country receiving more than 6 million dollars per day in Soviet economic and military aid. It also seems to demonstrate a lack of interest in an equitable settlement that would contribute to stability and prosperity in the region.

## South African Policies of Apartheid and Related Issues

### SECURITY COUNCIL CONSIDERATION

In 1987 the UN Security Council met 13 times to consider questions related to South Africa. It adopted two resolutions on the subject. Furthermore, in the name of the Council, the Council President issued two statements, one expressing deep concern over a South African Government decree prohibiting most forms of protest against detention without trial and one urging clemency for six black South Africans condemned to death. The two resolutions were sponsored by the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) members of the Security Council: Argentina, Congo, Ghana, the United Arab Emirates, and Zambia.

### Situation in South Africa

On February 12 on behalf of the African Group in the United Nations, Egypt requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider the situation in South Africa resulting from the intensification of repressive rule through the imposition of a state of emergency and the escalation of political violence in that country during the preceding 20 months.

Forty-nine speakers participated in the debate, which took place in seven consecutive meetings on February 17–20. Responding to the harsh criticism of most speakers against his Government's internal policies, the South African Permanent Representative warned that blacks in South Africa and the neighboring countries would suffer the most from sanctions. OnFebruary 19 the NAM members of the Council tabled a draft resolution that strongly condemned South Africa for its refusal to comply with the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly concerning the policy of Apartheid and that also imposed selective mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the UN Charter. The Council voted on this draft February 20. The vote was 10 to 3 (U.S.), with 2 abstentions. The United Kingdom joined the United States in voting against the draft resolution, thus constituting a double veto. In his explanation of vote, the U.S. Representative, Ambassador Herbert S. Okun, emphasized that all members of the Security Council "are searching for ways to eliminate Apartheid from the face of the earth." The United States was convinced, however, that "mandatory sanctions would fail to bring an end to Apartheid in a peaceful manner, and would make it difficult if not impossible to achieve internal reconciliation and regional economic development."

In informal consultations on April 15, the Security Council approved by consensus a draft statement expressing its deep concern about the recent South African Government decree prohibiting most forms of protest against detention without trial and its support of detainees. This document was issued as a Security Council Presidential Statement on April 16. The next day the South African Permanent Representative requested the UN Secretariat to circulate a letter from the South African Foreign Minister. In it the Foreign Minister rejected the standpoint of the Security Council Presidential Statement and emphasized the duty of the South African Government to maintain law and order.

In informal consultations on November 5, the Security Council considered the issuance of a Presidential Statement appealing the death sentence against Mulungisi Luphondo, a black South African political activist convicted of a double murder. The Council could not reach consensus on the issue, and therefore did not issue an appeal for clemency.

In informal consultations on December 18, the Security Council approved by consensus a Presidential Statement appealing for clemency in the case of the "Sharpeville Six." These were 6 black South Africans convicted of murdering a black municipal councilor in politically related violence 3 years earlier.

## Angolan Complaint

The Security Council took up an Angolan complaint against South Africa on two separate occasions in late 1987. In both cases the complaint grew out of the large-scale South Africa military incursion into Angola that began in early October.

On November 19 the NAM members of the Security Council, at the behest of Angola, requested an urgent meeting of the Council on the question of the South African incursion. Forty-nine speakers took part in the debate, which was spread over five meetings on November 20–25. At the opening of debate the Angolan Vice Foreign Minister asked the Council to adopt a resolution calling for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of South African forces from Angola and the cessation of direct and indirect aggression through UNITA (the Angolan anti-government insurgent movement). The South African Permanent Representative argued that the root cause of the conflict was the Angolan Government's violation of the 1975 Alvor Agreement (on the creation of a coalition with rival political elements). He declared that South Africa was prepared to withdraw its troops if agreement could be reached on the removal of all foreign forces (i.e., including the Cubans) by December 9.

On November 23 the NAM members of the Council tabled a draft resolution that strongly condemned South Africa for its "continued and intensified acts of aggression" against Angola, demanded an immediate and unconditional South African withdrawal, and directed the Secretary General to monitor the withdrawal and to report back to the Council by December 10.

The Security Council adopted this draft unanimously on November 25. (Resolution 602.) In his explanation of vote, the U.S. Permanent Representative, Ambassador Vernon A. Walters, stated that the United States had voted in favor of the resolution because it "shares with other members of the Council strong objections to the crossing of international borders by foreign forces." Ambassador Walters noted, however, that the resolution did not address many important issues regarding the southern African region — particularly "the fact that in Angola today there is both a civil war and a conflict involving foreign expeditionary forces in addition to those of South Africa."

Also on November 25, the South African Permanent Representative requested that a letter of the same date from the South African Foreign Minister be circulated as a Security Council document. In the letter the Foreign Minister rejected resolution 602 and maintained that his Government would itself decide when South African troops should be withdrawn from Angola.

In consultations on December 10, the Secretary General delivered an interim report to the Security Council on the implementation of resolution 602. At the direction of the Secretary General, a UN Secretariat team visited Angola on December 10–17. Based in part on the findings of the team, the Secretary General presented a formal written report to the Security Council on December 18. In it he noted that according to the Angolan Government, South African troops were still present in Angola and engaged in hostile activities.

On December 22 the NAM members of the Security Council requested that a formal meeting of the Council take place the next day. At the same time, they circulated a draft resolution that strongly condemned the continued South African occupation of parts of southern Angola, requested the Secretary General to continue monitoring the withdrawal of South African forces, and also requested him to report to the Council on implementation "at the earliest date." The Security Council met on December 23 and unanimously adopted the NAM draft with minor modifications. (Resolution 606.) The only speaker was the Representative of Angola, who thanked the Council for adopting resolutions 602 and 606 and charged that South Africa, while claiming to be withdrawing, was in fact reinforcing its forces in Angola.

On December 24 the South African Permanent Representative requested that a statement of the previous day by the South African Foreign Minister be circulated as a Security Council document. In the statement the Foreign Minister reiterated his Government's position that all foreign troops should leave Angola and that the current conflict was a direct result of the violation of the Alvor Agreement. He also noted the December 5 statement of the chief of the South African Defense Force that the process of withdrawal from Angola had already begun.

## GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION

### Policies of Apartheid

The General Assembly considered the question of "Policies of Apartheid of the Government of South Africa" at seven meetings between November 16 and 20, voting on eight resolutions during the last day of debate. The Assembly dealt with the issue in plenary, without prior reference to a main committee. The Assembly had before it: the annual report of the Special Committee Against Apartheid* with an addendum on relations between Israel and South Africa; the Report of the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply and Shipping of Oil and Petroleum Products to SouthAfrica;** three reports of the Secretary General (on the UN Trust Fund for South Africa, the Status of the International Convention Against Apartheid in Sports, and Concerted International Action for the Elimination of Apartheid); and the report of the Special Political Committee. In his capacity as chairman of the Special Committee Against Apartheid, the Permanent Representative of Nigeria opened the debate on November 16.

---

*The Special Committee Against Apartheid was established in 1962 as the "Special Committee on the Policies of the Government of the Republic of South Africa." The 18 members in 1987 were: Algeria, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Nepal, Nigeria, Peru, Philippines, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Trinidad and Tobago, and Ukrainian S.S.R. No Western members sit on the Committee.

**The Intergovernmental Group, established on the basis of General Assembly resolution 41/35 F of November 10, consists of representatives of the following 11 countries: Algeria, Cuba, German Democratic Republic, Indonesia, Kuwait, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Ukrainian S.S.R, and the United Republic of Tanzania.

He argued that during the previous year South Africa had increased both domestic repression and aggression against its neighbors, and that limited,government-initiated reform had failed to coopt the country's black majority. He also charged that "a few Western countries" had become "an obstacle to effective pressure" against South Africa because of their opposition to comprehensive mandatory sanctions.

During the 5-day debate, 111 speakers took part, not counting rights of reply and explanations of vote. Condemnation of South Africa's policy of Apartheid and its repression of domestic opposition was universal. Nearly all speakers also voiced support for comprehensive mandatory sanctions, with some warning the members of the Security Council that failure to adopt such measures would increase the likelihood of long-term violence in South Africa. Explicit criticism of the United States was relatively rare, but many delegations faulted "major Western powers" or "Permanent Members of the Security Council" for their opposition to mandatory sanctions. The representative of the African National Congress (ANC), the major South African anti-government insurgent movement, praised the passage of the U.S. Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act and commended "the American public's relentless efforts against Apartheid."

In her explanation of vote, the U.S. Representative, Ambassador Patricia M. Byrne, emphasized that "the United States absolutely rejects Apartheid and is fully committed to promoting a peaceful transition to nonracial democracy and justice for all in South Africa." The way to achieve this objective lay not, however, in international efforts to ravage the South African economy. U.S. policy was based instead on "carefully targeted political, diplomatic, and economic pressures." Ambassador Byrne noted the U.S. Government was pleased that, with one qualified exception, name-calling against the United States had finally disappeared from General Assembly resolutions on Apartheid. Nevertheless, the United States still had to disagree with some of the content of these resolutions. In particular, the United States could not accept language that legitimized armed struggle, called for comprehensive mandatory sanctions, or pointed a critical finger at one country for actions committed by many. In conclusion, Ambassador Byrne expressed regret that only one of the eight resolutions under consideration went beyond rhetoric and sought to provide direct practical assistance to the victims of Apartheid. This was the only resolution that the United States could support.

The first resolution, entitled "International Solidarity with the Liberation Struggle in South Africa," was introduced by Nigeria and had 50 other sponsors. It reaffirms the legitimacy of armed struggle, condemns the "policy and practices of Apartheid and in particular the execution of patriots and captured freedom fighters," and demands an end to the state of emergency in South Africa as well as the unconditional release of all political prisoners and detainees. The resolution also calls upon states to increase all forms of necessary assistance to "the people of South Africa and their national liberation movements," appeals for greater financial and material aid to the states bordering South Africa, and continues the authorization of funds from the UN's regular budget for the maintenance of offices in New York by the two principal South African insurgent movements, ANC and PAC (Pan African Congress). The United States voted against this resolution because of its reaffirmation of the legitimacy of armed struggle. Ambassador Byrne said in her explanation of vote that the United States objected to "the use of UN resolutions as a means to legitimize armed conflict. All sides must realize that violence only increases the likelihood of a catastrophic outcome in the region, and in South Africa in particular." This resolution was adopted by a vote of 129 to 3 (U.S.), with 22 abstentions. (Resolution 42/23 A.)

The second resolution, entitled "Application of Coordinated and Strictly Monitored Measures Against South Africa," was introduced by Kuwait, joined by 48 other sponsors. It "urges all states that have not yet done so, pending the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions, to adopt legislative and/or comparable measures to impose effective sanctions against South Africa." The resolution specifies embargoes on the supply of products that can be used by the South Africa military or nuclear industry, as well as an embargo on the supply of oil and petroleum products to South Africa. It also calls for a ban on the importation of coal, gold, strategic minerals, and agricultural products from South Africa and Namibia, the withdrawal of transnational corporations from both those countries, and the adoption of measures to ensure the effectiveness of the sports and cultural boycotts against South Africa. The United States voted against this resolution because of its advocacy of comprehensive mandatory sanctions. As Ambassador Byrne stated in her explanation of vote, "the United States must oppose all resolutions containing such prescripts. We do so because we firmly believe that sweeping, worldwide sanctions simply will not work." This resolution was adopted by a vote of 128 to 3 (U.S.), with 24 abstentions. (Resolution 42/23 B.)

The third resolution, entitled "Comprehensive and Mandatory Sanctions Against the Racist Regime of South Africa," was introduced by Nepal and had 43 cosponsors. It reaffirms that Apartheid is both a "crime against humanity and a threat to international peace and security," decides that "the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions by the Security Council under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations would be the most appropriate, effective and peaceful means to bring Apartheid to an end," and urgently requests the Security Council to take action to implement such sanctions. It also urges the Security Council to strengthen the mandatory arms embargo against South Africa initially imposed in 1977. This resolution also contains the only explicit critical reference to the United States in any of the eight resolutions on Apartheid. It urges the Governments of the United Kingdom and the United States "and others that are opposed to the application of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions to reassess their policies and cease their opposition to the application of such sanctions by the Security Council." The U.S. Delegation requested a separate vote on this paragraph, in an effort to have the reference removed. The General Assembly decided, however, to retain the reference by a vote of 78 to 38 (U.S.), with 27 abstentions.

The United States voted against the resolution as a whole because of its call for comprehensive mandatory sanctions. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 126 to 11 (U.S.), with 17 abstentions. (Resolution 43/23 C.)

The fourth resolution, entitled "Relations Between Israel and South Africa," was introduced by Sudan and had 37 other cosponsors. It calls on Israel "to desist from and terminate forthwith all forms of military, nuclear, intelligence, economic, and other collaboration" with South Africa. It also requests the Special Committee Against Apartheid to continue to monitor relations between Israel and South Africa and to report to the General Assembly and the Security Council as appropriate. The United States voted against the resolution because, in the words of Ambassador Byrne, it "points a finger at a single country for actions committed by many, including some who sit on the Special Committee Against Apartheid." This resolution was adopted November 20 by a vote of 103 to 29 (U.S.), with 23 abstentions. (Resolution 42/23 D.)

The fifth resolution, entitled "Program of Work of the Special Committee Against Apartheid," was introduced by Nigeria, joined by 48 other sponsors. The resolution commends the work of the Special Committee, takes note of the Committee's annual report and endorses the recommendations therein, and makes a special allocation of $390,000 to the Special Committee from the UN regular budget for special projects to be decided by the Committee. It also requests governments and other organizations to provide financial assistance both to the special projects of the Committee and to the Trust Fund for Publicity Against Apartheid. Lastly, the resolution appeals to governments, organizations, and individuals to cooperate with the Center Against Apartheid and the UN Department of Public Information in disseminating information on the "deteriorating situation in South Africa." The United States voted against this resolution because, as noted by Ambassador Byrne, it "allocates a large sum of money—in a time of financial austerity for the United Nations—for projects that in some cases interfere in the internal affairs of the United States." This resolution passed by a vote of 145 to 1 (U.S.), with 10 abstentions. (Resolution 42/23 E.)

The sixth resolution, entitled "Oil Embargo Against South Africa," was introduced by Norway, with 29 cosponsors. Taking note of the report of the Intergovernmental Group to Monitor the Supply and Shipping of Oil and Petroleum Products to South Africa, the resolution "again urges the Security Council to take action without further delay to impose a mandatory embargo on the supply and shipping of oil and petroleum products to South Africa as well as the supply of equipment and technology to its oil industry and coal liquefaction projects." The resolution goes on to request all states concerned to adopt effective oil embargo measures against South Africa pending a decision by the Security Council, and to cooperate with the Intergovernmental Group in the implementation of the present resolution. The United States voted against this resolution because of the mandatory nature of the embargo it prescribed. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 138 to 4 (U.S.), with 12 abstentions. (Resolution 42/23 F.)

The seventh resolution, entitled "Concerted International Action for the Elimination of Apartheid," was once again introduced by Norway and had 30 other sponsors. The resolution strongly condemns the policy of Apartheid and the actions of the South African Government against opposition groups and individuals. It further condemns the "overt and covert aggressive actions" of South Africa against neighboring states. The resolution demands that the South African authorities take a series of steps, including the release of all political prisoners, the lifting of the state of emergency and the initiation of a political dialogue "with genuine leaders of the majority population with a view to eradicating Apartheid without delay and establishing a representative government."

The seventh resolution goes on to urge the Security Council "to consider without delay the adoption of effective mandatory sanctions against South Africa," and also to take steps for the strict implementation of the mandatory arms embargo instituted in 1977. It appeals to all states, pending the imposition of mandatory sanctions by the Security Council, to consider enacting through national legislative or executive means a variety of selective sanctions against South Africa. It also appeals to states and organizations to increase assistance to the countries neighboring South Africa, as well as to the victims of Apartheid, liberation movements recognized by the OAU, and all those struggling for a "non-racial, democratic society in South Africa." In addition, the resolution appeals to governments and organizations to abide by the academic, cultural, scientific, and sports boycotts against South Africa. It also "reaffirms the legitimacy of the struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa for the total eradication of Apartheid and for the establishment of a nonracial, democratic society." The United States, once again, opposed this resolution because of its call for mandatory sanctions. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 149 to 2 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions. (Resolution 42/23 G.)

The eighth and final resolution, entitled "United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa," had 46 sponsors. It expresses appreciation to governments, organizations, and individuals who have contributed to the Trust Fund and to voluntary agencies assisting the victims of Apartheid. The resolution appeals for increased contributions to both the Trust Fund and these voluntary agencies, and commends the trustees of the Fund for their administration of assistance to persons persecuted under Apartheid and to refugees from the system. The United States joined consensus on this resolution, which was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 42/23 H.)

## Other African Questions

### COMORIAN ISLAND OF MAYOTTE

The question of the Comorian island of Mayotte has been included in the General Assembly's agenda since 1976. The dispute between France and the Federal Islamic Republic of the Comoros centers on the status of the Island of Mayotte, whose largely Christian population in referendums in 1974 and 1976 indicated a preference to remain a part of France rather than associate with the other, predominantly Moslem, Comoros Islands which gained independence in 1975.

In the 42nd General Assembly the Mayotte question was considered in plenary on November 11. Following speeches by eight delegations, including the Comoros and France, the Assembly voted on a draft resolution that was identical to the one adopted the year before. It reaffirmed the sovereignty of the Comoros over Mayotte, called for the "translation into practice" of the wish expressed by the President of France to seek a just solution, and urged France to accelerate the process of negotiations with a view to ensuring the return of Mayotte to the Comoros. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 128 to 1, with 22 abstentions (U.S.). (Resolution 42/17.)

### COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE ORGANIZATION OF AFRICAN UNITY

The African Group in the United Nations annually introduces a draft resolution in the General Assembly that calls for cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity (OAU). Madagascar, as chairman of the African Group, tabled the draft at the 42nd General Assembly. It closely resembled the resolution on the OAU adopted by consensus the year before. As in previous years, the draft requested the Secretary General to strengthen cooperation with the OAU, called on UN agencies to ensure the equitable representation of Africans on their staffs, expressed appreciation to the United Nations for its economic assistance to Africa, and reiterated the determination of the United Nations and the OAU to work "to eliminate colonialism, racial discrimination, and Apartheid in southern Africa." The General Assembly adopted the African Group draft by consensus on October 28. (Resolution 42/9.)

### OBSERVER STATUS FOR THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The African Development Bank was established in 1964 under the auspices of the UN Economic Commission for Africa, for the purpose of contributing to the "economic development and social progress of its members—individually and jointly." Its membership comprises the 50 members of the UN African Group plus 25 non-regional members (including the United States). The headquarters of the African Development Bank is in Abidjan, Cote d'Ivoire.

On May 12 the Cote d'Ivoire requested that a new item, proposing observer status for the Bank be placed on the provisional agenda of the 42nd General Assembly. The Assembly took up this item on October 28, at the same meeting in which it adopted the resolution on cooperation between the UN and the OAU. The Cote d'Ivoire introduced a draft that noted the desire of the African Development Bank for cooperation with the UN and invited the Bank to participate in the work of the General Assembly in the capacity of observer. The Assembly adopted this draft by consensus. (Resolution 42/10.)

## Falkland Islands (Malvinas) Question

The United Kingdom has controlled the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) since 1833. Argentina also claims sovereignty over the islands, which lie 250 miles off the southeastern tip of Argentina, based on having inherited a Spanish claim to them. Historical evidence suggests that the islands were uninhabited before British settlement. The dispute was greatly exacerbated in 1982 when the military regime ruling Argentina at that time sought to occupy the islands.

The United States does not take a position on the competing legal sovereignty claims. The British have stated their willingness to consider normalizing relations with Argentina but maintain that the question of sovereignty is not negotiable. Argentina has asked for negotiations on all issues, including sovereignty. President Alfonsin, elected in 1983, has stated publicly that Argentina will use only peaceful means to assert its claims to the islands. In 1986 tensions heightened over the issue of South Atlantic fisheries. In 1987 the two sides were in indirect contact in an effort to reach agreement on arrangements to deal with fisheries-related issues and to reduce the risk of incidents occurring between them in the South Atlantic. Both nations have reiterated their desire to improve relations.

Since 1982 the United States has supported resolutions in the General Assembly that call for negotiations between the United Kingdom and Argentina. The 42nd General Assembly on November 17 adopted Argentina's draft resolution on the Falkland Islands (Malvinas) by a vote of 114 (U.S.) to 5, with 36 abstentions. (Resolution 42/19.) The resolution was substantively identical to the 1986 resolution, calling on the two countries to initiate negotiations to resolve "peacefully and definitively the problems pending between both countries, including all aspects of the future of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas).

Sixteen countries spoke in the debate to support the call for negotiations. The United Kingdom described the Argentine resolution as "a thinly disguised demand for negotiations" the end result of which would be annexation of the islands by Argentina," and a vote for it as "a vote against the principle of self-determination." Argentina reiterated the legal and historical arguments that support its claim to sovereignty over the islands and criticized the United Kingdom for refusing to negotiate all aspects of the problem as requested by the General Assembly. The United States did not speak in the debate.

## Situation in Central America

### GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION

The General Assembly adopted by consensus on October 7 a resolution cosponsored by 13 Latin American countries supportive of the agreement signed in Guatemala City on August 7 by the Presidents of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua entitled "Procedure for the Establishment of a Firm and Lasting Peace in Central America." (Resolution 42/1.) It requested the Secretary General "to afford the fullest support to the Central American governments in their effort to achieve peace." Explaining the U.S. vote, Ambassador Alberto Martinez Piedra affirmed that "the struggle for democracy is an indispensable part of the struggle for peace in Central America," and said that "a truly democratic society will not emerge without national reconciliation." He noted U.S. security concerns and emphasized that the Organization of American States should take the lead in assuring compliance with the Guatemala accords.

### ICJ Decision on Nicaragua

By a vote of 94 to 2 (U.S.), with 48 abstentions, Nicaragua secured on November 12 General Assembly passage of a resolution calling for "full and immediate compliance" with the June 1986 International Court of Justice decision. (Resolution 42/18.) Ambassador Vernon Walters stated that the United States had withdrawn from the case in 1984 "because the Court had neither jurisdiction nor competence over the subject matter." Nicaragua was using a "judicial forum to achieve a political goal." The resolution treated "as central to the conflict in Central America an issue that is in fact a result of the conflict and peripheral to it." Ambassador Walters noted the interlocking nature of commitments made by the Central American nations in the Guatemala Peace Agreement of August 1987 and called on the government of Nicaragua to "join its fellow Central Americans in creating a democracy that can take root and represent all of the people." The high number of abstentions and absences denied Nicaragua the decisive victory that it desired. The vote resembled closely the results of the 1986 balloting on a similar resolution at the 41st General Assembly.

### Nicaraguan Trade Embargo

The Nicaraguan Delegation tabled a resolution in the Second Committee deploring the continuation of the U.S. trade embargo and seeking its immediate revocation. The United States reiterated its belief that this resolution, similar to that introduced at the 41st General Assembly last year, was inappropriate and unhelpful given the peace process then underway. The United States rejected any implication that U.S. trade restrictions against Nicaragua are illegal or improper under international law. The United States also held that the Second Committee is an inappropriate forum for discussion of the question and declined to participate in subsequent consideration of the item. The Second Committee adopted the resolution by a margin of 89 to 3 (U.S.), with 35 abstentions. The resolution was subsequently adopted in the plenary session by a nearly identical vote, 83 to 2 (U.S.), with 44 abstentions.

In his explanation of vote, U.S. Ambassador Vernon Walters characterized the resolution as a direct attack on the United States since it ignored the reasons for a trade embargo against Nicaragua. The resolution also ignored Nicaragua's violations of human and civil rights and its interference in the affairs of neighboring states. Ambassador Walters also pointed out the hypocrisy in this condemnation of the United States by nations which advocate similar embargoes against other countries. Furthermore, Nicaragua, as well as the cosponsors of the resolution, advocate such embargoes as a legitimate instrument of policy against other countries. Ambassador Walters pointed out that a vote in favor of the resolution amounted to tacit acceptance of a double standard. Such actions damage the credibility of the United Nations and contribute to erosion of support for the organization.

## Other Latin American and Caribbean Questions

### COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

The United States cosponsored a consensus resolution adopted by the General Assembly on promotion and expansion of cooperation between the United Nations and the Organization of American States "to increase the capacity of both organizations to achieve their common goals." (Resolution 42/11.) The resolution requested the Secretary General to coordinate with the Secretary General of the OAS to promote meetings between representatives of the two organizations for the purpose of "holding consultations on policies, projects, measures, and procedures which will facilitate and broaden cooperation between them."

### COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE LATIN AMERICAN ECONOMIC SYSTEM

On October 28, the United States joined the General Assembly consensus on a resolution on cooperation with the Latin American Economic System, established by convention on October 17, 1975. (Resolution 42/12.) The resolution, besides requesting the Secretary General to take the necessary measures to strengthen and broaden cooperation with the Latin American economic system, also urged the specialized agencies and other organizations and programs of the UN system to cooperate with it.

## Cyprus

The Secretary General continued the pursuit of his good offices mission during 1987. The positions of the two sides remained essentially the same throughout the year. Turkish Cypriot leader Denktash continued to assert that he was ready to sign the draft framework agreement presented to the two sides by the Secretary General on March 29. The Greek Cypriot side restated its inability to accept that document. The Secretary General suggested that low-level proximity talks be held to attempt to arrange a compromise, but was unable to work out modalities with both sides.

U.S. officials met with various Cypriot, Turkish, and Greek officials throughout the year to underline the continuing U.S. determination to promote a peaceful and enduring solution to the Cyprus question and to support the Secretary General's latest initiative. There was no General Assembly action on Cyprus during the 42nd session.

The Secretary General appointed a new Special Representative to Cyprus, Oscar Camilion, a former Argentine foreign minister. Camilion visited Cyprus in December 1987, and held talks with leaders of the Government of Cyprus and the Turkish Cypriot Community. The new Representative planned to take up residence in Cyprus early in 1988.

On June 12 and December 14, the Security Council renewed the mandate of the UN Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP), each time for an additional 6 months. (Resolutions 597 and 604 of 1987.) During this time the Government of Sweden carried out its decision to withdraw its troop contingent from UNFICYP, due to lack of progress in resolving the Force's increasing financial problems. The United States fully supports the Secretary General's ongoing efforts to put UNFICYP on a sounder financial footing, and continues to encourage increased voluntary contributions to UNFICYP, particularly by those governments whose contributions are not commensurate with their financial capability and with their interest in a stable Cyprus.

# DISARMAMENT AND ARMS CONTROL

## UN Disarmament Commission

The UN Disarmament Commission (UNDC) is a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly and is open to all UN member states. It meets annually in New York for 3–4 weeks in May and conducts deliberations on arms control and security issues assigned to it by resolutions adopted by the General

Assembly. In contrast to the General Assembly, the Disarmament Commission does not vote on resolutions but adopts recommendations to the Assembly by consensus. The 1987 session of the UNDC was held under the chairmanship of Ambassador Dimiter Kostov (Bulgaria) from May 4 to May 27. Seven substantive agenda items were considered, five of which were carried over from the 1986 session, namely, nuclear/conventional disarmament, reduction of military budgets, South Africa's nuclear capability, the role of the United States in disarmament, and naval arms/disarmament. The two new items added to the agenda were: conventional disarmament and verification.

In order to facilitate the development of recommendations, the Disarmament Commission establishes working groups or contact groups. In 1987 the UNDC created working groups for four agenda items, namely, South Africa's nuclear capability, the role of the United Nations in disarmament, conventional disarmament, and verification. A contact group dealt with nuclear/conventional disarmament, and a consultation group dealt with the reduction of military budgets. The item on naval armaments/disarmament was handled by means of consultations conducted by the chairman of the UNDC.

Working Group I, chaired by Juan Fischer (Uruguay), dealt with the question of South Africa's nuclear capability. Discussions continued to be deadlocked over the issue of whether or not South Africa has a nuclear weapons capability and over allegations of Western/Israeli collaboration with South Africa in developing such a capability.

Discussions in Working Group II on the Role of the United Nations in Disarmament (ROUND) were based upon a large number of papers proposing organizational and procedural changes in the UN machinery on disarmament issues. In order to expedite work, the Group's chairman, Ambassador Engo (Cameroon), decided to establish an open-ended contact group, coordinated by Ambassador Butler (Australia). The contact group considered a working paper prepared by Ambassador Butler but was unable to reach consensus on it. The paper was eventually annexed to the UNDC Report and, together with a number of working papers submitted by various delegations, will be before the UNDC for consideration at its 1988 session.

The complex subject of conventional disarmament was considered for the first time by the UNDC in 1987 in accordance with General Assembly resolutions 41/59 C and 41/59 G, sponsored by Denmark and China respectively, and adopted by consensus in 1986. The UNDC established Working Group III to discuss this subject, including the conclusions and recommendations contained in the UN Study on Conventional Disarmament. The chairman of the Working Group, Ambassador Mellbin (Denmark), and various delegations submitted working papers, none of which succeeded in achieving consensus. Working Group III recommended that this item be considered further at the 1988 session of the Disarmament Commission.

The important subject of verification of compliance with arms control agreements was also considered by the UNDC for the first time, based upon General Assembly resolution 41/86 Q, adopted by consensus in 1986. The Commission established Working Group IV to deal with verification in all its aspects, including principles, provisions, and techniques to promote the inclusion of adequate verification in arms limitation and disarmament agreements and the role of the United Nations and its member states in the field of verification. Working Group IV was chaired by Ambassador Roche (Canada) and arrived at a widespread agreement that verification is a critically important element in the negotiation and implementation of arms control agreements. The Working Group also reached agreement on an illustrative, non-exhaustive list of principles of verification, and recommended that the UNDC continue deliberations on this matter at its session in 1988.

Deliberations on the perennial item of nuclear/conventional disarmament, under Ambassador Teja (India) as coordinator of the contact group on this subject, remained inconclusive as fundamental differences persisted on many of the proposed recommendations under this agenda item. In fact, the heavily bracketed text was further burdened by the inclusion of additional controversial proposals. The item was again deferred, as in previous years.

Consultations on the reduction of military budgets under the chairmanship of Mr. Tinca (Romania) remained deadlocked over disagreements on the principles of transparency and comparability advocated by the Western members of this group. Since these principles were unacceptable to the East, the consultation group recommended to the UNDC that the paper entitled "Principles which should govern further actions of states in the field of freezing and reduction of military budgets" be transmitted to the General Assembly with the language concerning those principles placed in brackets.

The item armaments/disarmament reappeared on the UNDC agenda as a result of the adoption by the General Assembly in 1986 of a Swedish-sponsored resolution on this subject (41/59 K). The United States voted against that resolution on the grounds that, *inter alia*, naval armaments cannot be considered for arms control purposes in isolation from other military forces. Therefore, the United States did not participate in the informal consultations on this subject conducted by the chairman of the Disarmament Commission, who produced a working paper as the basis of future deliberations on the subject.

At the conclusion of its session, the UNDC adopted its report to the 42nd General Assembly, which adopted a resolution taking note of it without a vote (Resolution 42/42 G). The resolution also requested the Disarmament Commission to continue its work at its 1988 substantive session on outstanding items on its agenda, to submit a special report with recommendations on them to the third special session of the General

Assembly devoted to disarmament, as well as a report to the 43rd General Assembly.

## Conference on Disarmament

The Conference on Disarmament (CD), known until 1984 as the Committee on Disarmament, is a forum for the negotiation of multilateral arms control and disarmament agreements. It has 40 members, including the 5 nuclear-weapon states, and meets in Geneva.* The CD is an autonomous body with its own rules of procedure. However, it is linked to the United Nations through a personal representative of the UN Secretary General, who serves as secretary general of the Conference. The United Nations also provides administrative support to the Conference through the regular UN budget. The CD reports annually on its activities to the General Assembly, and resolutions adopted by the Assembly frequently request the Conference to consider specific disarmament matters.

The CD meets each year in a two-part session. In 1987 the Conference was in session February 3–April 30, and June 9–August 28. The U.S. Representative to the Conference was Ambassador Max Friedersdorf, who headed a Delegation of officials drawn from the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; the Departments of State, Defense, and Energy; and the Office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. During its 1987 session, the CD held 51 formal plenary meetings and 23 informal meetings. The Conference's rules of procedure provide that non-member states may, on request, submit papers and make statements at formal plenary meetings, as well as at meetings of subsidiary bodies of the Conference. Accordingly, during 1987, a number of non-member states also participated in various CD activities.

The Conference on Disarmament addressed a wide range of disarmament issues during 1987. Those items receiving the most attentionwere: chemical weapons; outer space arms control; nuclear-test ban; nuclear disarmament; the prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters; new weapons of mass destruction and radiological weapons; and a comprehensive program of disarmament. As in the past, the Conference formed *Ad Hoc* committees to deal with some of the specific items on its agenda. Five such *Ad Hoc* committees were reestablished from the 1986 session of the CD. These were the committees on chemical weapons, radiological weapons, arms control in outer space, a comprehensive program of disarmament, and on negative security assurances.

---

*Members of the Conference on Disarmament are: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Canada, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, German Democratic Republic, Federal Republic of Germany, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Romania, Sri Lanka, Sweden, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, and Zaire.

## *AD HOC* COMMITTEES

### Chemical Weapons

The Conference's *Ad Hoc* Committee on Chemical Weapons, chaired by Ambassador Ekeus (Sweden), was reestablished in February 1987 with a mandate to, *inter alia*, "continue the full and complete process of negotiations, developing and working out the convention, except for its final drafting. . . with a view to giving the Conference a possibility to achieve an agreement as soon as possible." The 1987 report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Chemical Weapons was adopted on August 26, updating the "rolling text" of the convention to reflect work done in 1987. At the 1987 session, the Soviet Union acknowledged for the first time possession of chemical weapons, and announced that it had ceased production and was building a chemical weapons destruction (CW) facility. In October, CD delegations accepted a Soviet invitation to visit the U.S.S.R. chemical weapons facility at Shikhany, and in November a Soviet Delegation accepted a longstanding U.S. invitation to visit the U.S. chemical weapons destruction facility at Tooele, Utah.

In the chemical weapons negotiations, security concerns, particularly verification issues, were addressed with greater attention. The Soviet Union moved closer to longstanding Western proposals for on-site verification measures, accepting, in principle, mandatory challenge inspections. However, the 40-nation Conference must still identify and negotiate detailed procedures necessary to ensure adequate verification, including arrangements to monitor nonproduction of chemical weapons by civilian chemical industries. Also, the issue must be addressed of how to ensure the security of states during the stockpile destruction period. Finally, important differences remain on a number of key issues such as treaty implementing provisions, allocation of costs, and technical assistance.

The chemical weapons negotiations were discussed at the periodic U.S.-Soviet bilateral meetings. At the Washington Summit in December 1987, President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev agreed on the need to conclude a "truly global" chemical weapons convention encompassing all CW-capable states. Pursuant to a 1985 Summit agreement to accelerate the chemical weapons negotiations, the United States and Soviet Union held two rounds of bilateral discussions on CW treaty issues during 1987. Also, two U.S.-Soviet bilateral discussions were held that year to discuss ways to prevent the dangerous proliferation of chemical weapons. The United States also held informal discussions with Western countries to review ways to optimize export controls on specific chemicals related to the manufacture of chemical weapons.

### Outer Space Arms Control

The *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space was reestablished in 1987, with a mandate similar to that adopted in

1986. Between March 13 and August 24, 1987, the *Ad Hoc* Committee met a total of 18 times under the chairmanship of Ambassador Pugliese (Italy) and discussed, *inter alia,* the existing legal regime applicable to outer space. Thus far, neither the United States nor the CD has been able to identify any outer space arms control issues appropriate for multilateral negotiations.

### Radiological Weapons

The *Ad Hoc* Committee on Radiological Weapons was reestablished in 1987 under the chairmanship of Ambassador Meiszter (Hungary), with a view to reaching agreement on a convention prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling, and use of radiological weapons. The Committee continued its examination of two major questions that have been before it for a number of years: the prohibition of radiological weapons as such, and the prohibition of attacks against nuclear facilities. On both questions, major differences over substance and approach continued to exist.

### Comprehensive Program of Disarmament

The *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Comprehensive Program of Disarmament (CPD) met again during 1987 under the chairmanship of Ambassador Garcia Robles (Mexico). Despite intensive efforts, the Committee was unable to resolve the numerous outstanding issues. The Committee agreed to recommend to the CD that work on the elaboration of the CPD document be continued during the 1988 session, with the goal of attempting to complete preparation of a draft CPD document in time for submission to the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (June 1988).

### Negative Security Assurances

The *Ad Hoc* Committee, which has been reestablished each year of the CD since 1979 to consider international arrangements to assure the non-nuclear-weapon states against the use, or threat of use, of nuclear weapons against them, did not meet in 1987. The five nuclear-weapon states have offered unilateral assurances to the non-nuclear-weapon states. The United States assurances, first offered in 1978, stand as a reliable statement of U.S. policy. However, the Conference has made little progress on the question of international arrangements.

## OTHER ISSUES

In addition to the work of the *Ad Hoc* Committees, the Conference on Disarmament addressed a number of other issues, including the following:

### Nuclear-Test Ban

As is customary, the agenda item on a "nuclear-test ban" was considered in plenary. In addition, efforts were made to find a basis to continue work on this item in an *Ad Hoc* committee of the CD. While no delegation opposed the reestablishment of such a body, which has not met since 1983, there was no agreement on what its mandate should be. Thus, a committee was not established.

There were several proposals on the table in this regard. The United States was a cosponsor of a proposal, first put forward in 1984 by a number of Western states (CD/521), that such a committee be established to resume its substantive examination of specific issues relating to a nuclear-test ban, including the issues of scope, verification, and compliance. In 1985 the United States also joined other Western states in proposing a detailed program of work for a committee (CD/621), under the mandate proposed in CD/521. Proposals made by others called for urgent negotiation of a nuclear-test ban. The United States and others maintained that the Conference had not completed the work commenced in the previous *Ad Hoc* working group in 1982 and 1983, and that work should be completed prior to considering changing the focus of the CD's efforts.

The Conference's *Ad Hoc* Group of Scientific Experts To Consider International Cooperative Measures To Detect and Identify Seismic Events met twice during 1987 and discussed its 1986 report on the technical test which took place under its sponsorship in late 1984 and early 1985. The technical test was a lengthy exercise in methods to exchange and process on a global basis large amounts of seismic data, as envisioned for monitoring the underground environment under a future test ban. The *Ad Hoc* group submitted its report on the technical test in August 1986 as document CD/720.

### Prevention of Nuclear War

This subject was first included on the CD's agenda in 1983, as part of the nuclear disarmament agenda item. In 1984 the CD decided to accord it a separate place on the agenda. A wide range of views were expressed in plenary consideration of this issue to determine how the Conference might best further treat it in 1987. Western states continued to emphasize the need for preventing all wars, not just nuclear war. Since there was no agreement on establishing an *Ad Hoc* group, the issue was discussed in plenary.

### Cessation of the Nuclear Arms Race and Nuclear Disarmament

This item was again discussed in the CD plenary under the president of the Conference and several new documents were submitted on this subject. No agreement was reached on establishing an *Ad Hoc* committee.

### Membership

In 1983 the Conference on Disarmament accepted in principle a limited expansion of its membership, not to exceed four states. A number of nonmember countries have submitted requests for membership: Norway, Finland, Austria, Turkey, Senegal, Bangladesh, Spain, Vietnam, Ireland, Tunisia, Ecuador, Cameroon, and Greece. Consultations on expanding the CD's membership were held in 1984, 1985, 1986, and again in 1987, but there was no consensus on the proposed candidates.

## General Assembly Consideration

Although the UN Charter adopted in 1945 gave no immediate priority to disarmament, it provides that the "General Assembly may consider the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments."

The advent of nuclear weapons came only weeks after the signing of the UN Charter, and provided immediate impetus to concepts of arms limitation and disarmament. In fact, the first resolution of the first meeting of the General Assembly (January 24, 1946) was entitled, "The Establishment of a Commission to Deal With the Problems Raised by the Discovery of Atomic Energy," and called upon the Commission to make specific proposals for "the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons and of all other major weapons adaptable to mass destruction."

Since the early years of the United Nations, great-power disagreement has hampered efforts to promote arms control and disarmament within the UN system. However, the United Nations has undertaken continuing efforts to develop organizational machinery that can effectively address disarmament issues.

### FIRST COMMITTEE DISARMAMENT ISSUES

In mid-October of each year, the First Committee of the General Assembly convenes to consider arms control and disarmament issues. The Committee holds general debates, considers specific aspects of arms control issues on its agenda, adopts resolutions on these issues, and forwards them to the General Assembly for further action.

During its 1987 session, the Committee adopted a total of 68 resolutions and two "decisions," all related in some way to disarmament. These resolutions addressed such subjects as recognition of established treaty regimes and the need for their universalization, reaffirmation of studies to investigate current disarmament questions, consideration of relevant reports prepared for the General Assembly, adoption of institutional and/or symbolic measures to encourage progress, and identification of specific disarmament goals for the international community.

Examples of the first category are resolutions 42/30 and 42/37 B. The former concerns the Convention on the Prohibition or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects; the resolution urged states which have not yet done so To become parties to the Convention. The latter resolution concerns the outcome of the Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction. Both of these resolutions were adopted without a vote.

The First Committee adopted two resolutions relating to earlier disarmament studies. Resolution 42/38 E, introduced by Denmark, recalled the study on conventional disarmament and requested the UN Disarmament Commission to continue its consideration of this subject at its 1988 session including the findings and recommendations of that study; it was adopted without a vote. The other resolution, introduced by Sweden, recalled the study on the naval arms race and requested the Disarmament Commission to continue its consideration of this subject at its 1988 session. This resolution was adopted in plenary by a vote of 154 to 1 (U.S.), with 2 abstentions (Resolution 42/38 K). The United States voted against this resolution because the United States considers the study on naval armaments to be based on a faulty premise.

Several resolutions were adopted by the First Committee that were intended to encourage international disarmament measures by focusing attention on the general questions involved, or on the institutional mechanisms available to the world community. These resolutions addressed such issues as: objective information on military matters, adopted in the General Assembly plenary by a vote of 133 (U.S.) to 0, with 12 abstentions (Resolution 42/38 I); the observance of Disarmament Week, adopted in plenary by a vote of 133 to 0, with 21 (U.S.) abstentions (Resolution 42/42 H); a review of the role of the United Nations in disarmament, adopted without a vote (Resolution 42/38 O); international cooperation for disarmament, adopted by the plenary by a vote of 118 to 18 (U.S.), with 14 abstentions (Resolution 42/42 E); and the convening, under proper conditions, of a World Disarmament Conference, adopted without a vote. (Resolution 42/41.) Also in this category of institutional mechanisms was a new resolution, introduced by Cameroon, which recommended various steps to rationalize the work of the First Committee. It was adopted in the plenary by a vote of 134 (U.S.) to 0, with 20 abstentions. (Resolution 42/42 N.)

The First Committee adopted a resolution of an institutional nature in the disarmament field to which the United States took exception. It called upon the UN Security Council, particularly its Permanent Members, to take steps to enhance the role of the United Nations in arms limitation and disarmament, primarily in the nuclear field. It also recommended that the Council consider establishing subsidiary bodies to facilitate a solution to disarmament issues. The resolution was adopted by the First Committee on November 11 by a vote of 103 to 1 (U.S.), with 21 abstentions; it was adopted in the plenary on November 30 by a vote of 129 to 1 (U.S.), with 23 abstentions

(Resolution 42/39A). Following the Committee vote, the United States explained its negative vote on the grounds that the United Nations neither can nor should play a central role in nuclear arms reduction negotiations:

> The Security Council has the potential to play a crucial role in the maintenance of international peace and security, when its members, acting on behalf of the full UN membership, are able to find common ground. However, the Security Council is incapable institutionally of assuming a preeminent role on nuclear arms reductions. Security Council debates would merely duplicate discussions already being held in the Conference on Disarmament, the First Committee and the Disarmament Commission. Furthermore, the creation of new disarmament machinery under the Security Council would needlessly duplicate the ongoing responsibilities of the Department of Disarmament Affairs.

Finally, the First Committee approved several hortatory resolutions emphasizing the obligation of member states to take concrete measures toward disarmament. Resolution 42/38 G, introduced by China, encouraged all states, including the "member states of the two major military alliances," to take appropriate steps to promote progress in conventional disarmament; it was adopted without a vote. Resolution 42/38 N, introduced by Peru, expressed firm support for efforts by regional groups of states to take concrete steps toward negotiating regional agreements on conventional disarmament; it was adopted by the General Assembly by a vote of 154 (U.S.) to 0, with 0 abstentions. Belgium introduced a resolution along similar lines which encouraged regional solutions to disarmament and requested the United Nations to assist states and regional institutions to this end. It was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 42/39 E.) Resolution 42/38 J, introduced by Czechoslovakia, deemed it important that member states make every effort to facilitate the implementation of General Assembly resolutions in the field of disarmament. It was adopted by the plenary by a vote of 128 to 2 (U.S.), with 24 abstentions. The United States explained that it voted against this resolution because General Assembly resolutions on disarmament are strictly recommendations, and there is no basis in the Charter for according them any kind of binding status.

In addition, the Committee adopted and forwarded to the General Assembly a considerable number of resolutions of special interest. These are treated in greater detail in the following sections.

## THIRD SPECIAL SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY DEVOTED TO DISARMAMENT

By resolution 38/73 I, adopted by consensus in 1983, the General Assembly decided to hold a Third Special Session Devoted to Disarmament (SSOD III) at a time to be determined by the 40th General Assembly, but not later than 1988. However, in 1985 the 40th General Assembly postponed the decision on timing until the following year. The 41st General Assembly in 1986 charged a preparatory committee to submit recommendations to the 42nd General Assembly on questions relating to SSOD III, including the setting of a date. (Resolution 41/60 G.) The Preparatory Committee, which met in May/June 1987, merely recommended that SSOD III be held in 1988, prior to the convening of the 43rd General Assembly.

At the 42nd General Assembly, Yugoslavia introduced a resolution in the First Committee which set May 31 to June 25, 1988, as the dates for SSOD III. It recommended that the Preparatory Committee, at its meeting in early 1988, consider substantive issues for possible incorporation in the concluding document(s) of the special session, as well as any remaining organizational and procedural matters. The resolution also requested member states engaged in bilateral, regional or multilateral arms control negotiations outside of the UN framework to submit appropriate information on such negotiations to the General Assembly prior to SSOD III. The resolution was adopted by the First Committee on November 16 and by the plenary on November 30, in both cases without a vote. (Resolution 42/40.)

Following the First Committee action, the U.S. Delegation expressed its reservations about several paragraphs in the resolution. The United States pointed out, for example, that the Final Document of the First Special Session on Disarmament "has remained a static document," whereas "international realities, and both national and international security requirements affected by them, have evolved." As a result, these realities "may no longer be fully or accurately reflected in a document developed in the light of the situation pertaining over 9 years ago." The United States, in stating its intention to participate constructively in the work of the third special session, also expressed its expectation that the UN Secretariat will prepare the necessary documentation for the session "on the basis of existing resources, to the extent possible."

## PREVENTION OF NUCLEAR WAR

Since 1981, non-aligned countries have proposed resolutions in the General Assembly expressing the urgent need to take steps to prevent nuclear war and calling on the Conference on Disarmament to begin negotiations to that end.

In previous years, Western countries, led by the Federal Republic of Germany, had tabled draft resolutions containing Western views on preventing nuclear war. However, in the face of opposition from non-aligned countries, these drafts were not put to a vote. In 1987, as in 1986, the Federal Republic of Germany did not introduce a draft on the subject, thus leaving the traditional Argentine resolution, introduced on October 27, as the only one considered by the First Committee on the prevention of nuclear war. Argentina's text was substantially similar to that of previous years. Describing the issue as a matter of the "highest priority," it requested the Conference on Disarmament once again to establish an *Ad Hoc* committee to negotiate measures designed to prevent nuclear war.

The Argentine resolution was approved in the First Committee on

November 10 by a vote of 108 to 3 (U.S.), with 14 abstentions, and adopted in the Assembly plenary on November 30 by 140 to 3 (U.S.), with 14 abstentions. The United States voted against the resolution because of its attempts to arrogate to the First Committee authority reserved to the Conference on Disarmament to decide its own work program, and because the United States believes it is necessary to prevent all wars, not just nuclear war. (Resolution 42/42 D.)

## RADIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

Since 1979 the General Assembly has adopted a resolution every year supporting the negotiation of a convention to ban the development, production, stockpiling, and use of radiological weapons. It was in that year that the United States and the Soviet Union submitted a joint proposal on the major elements of such a treaty to the Conference on Disarmament. These resolutions for the most part have been adopted each year without a vote.

The 1987 version of the resolution on a radiological weapons convention was tabled on October 20 by Hungary, in its capacity as chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Radiological Weapons during the 1987 session of the Conference on Disarmament, and was cosponsored by Japan, Indonesia, and Sweden. It was largely procedural and essentially similar to its predecessors. The resolution recognized the utility of the work performed by the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Radiological Weapons during 1987 and requested the Conference on Disarmament to continue its negotiations toward a convention to ban radiological weapons.

The resolution was adopted on November 6 without a vote in the First Committee on and in the plenary on November 30. (Resolution 42/38 B.)

As it has done in previous years, Iraq introduced a second resolution on radiological weapons on October 26. Asserting that Israel's 1981 attack on an Iraqi nuclear facility constituted an unprecedented danger to international peace and security, the resolution declared that military attacks of any kind against nuclear installations were "tantamount to the use of radiological weapons" and requested the Conference on Disarmament to reach early agreement on the prohibition of such attacks. The United States voted against this resolution because of its criticism of Israel and because the United States does not accept the premise that a radiological weapons treaty should deal with attacks on peaceful nuclear facilities.

The Iraqi resolution was approved in the First Committee on November 11 by a vote of 94 to 2 (U.S.), with 27 abstentions. The General Assembly plenary adopted the resolution on November 30 by a vote of 119 to 2 (U.S.), with 32 abstentions. (Resolution 42/38 F.)

## PREVENTION OF AN ARMS RACE IN OUTER SPACE

At the 42nd General Assembly, four draft resolutions were tabled in the First Committee on the subject of outer space arms control. The draft from the Soviet Union called for the creation of a "world space organization" (as did the Soviet text in 1985), called for strict adherence to the ABM Treaty, and endorsed the proposal for an international verification inspectorate to ensure the peaceful uses of outer space. China tabled a draft critical of the inability of the Conference on Disarmament to begin negotiations on outer space arms control, while France, on behalf of the Western states, presented a resolution offering Western views on the issue. Ultimately, all three of these resolutions were withdrawn, and a fourth resolution, introduced by Egypt and Sri Lanka on behalf of non-aligned countries, was voted upon by the Committee.

Drafted along lines similar to the corresponding text of 1986 (Resolution 41/53), the Egyptian-Sri Lankan resolution once again requested the Conference on Disarmament to establish an *Ad Hoc* committee at its 1988 session "with a view to undertaking negotiations for the conclusion of an agreement or agreements. . . to prevent an arms race in outer space" (operative paragraph nine). The resolution was approved by the First Committee on November 16 by a vote of 127 to 1 (U.S.), with 0 abstentions. It was adopted in plenary on November 30 by a vote of 154 to 1 (U.S.), with 0 abstentions. (Resolution 42/33.)

The United States objected in particular to operative paragraph nine of the resolution because the United States does not believe there is a basis for multilateral negotiations on outer space arms control at this time, and called for a separate vote on it in the Assembly plenary on November 30. The paragraph was approved by a vote of 141 to 1 (U.S.), with 11 abstentions. Because of U.S. opposition to paragraph nine, and because of implicit criticism elsewhere in the text of the Strategic Defense Initiative, the United States voted against the resolution as a whole.

## ISRAELI NUCLEAR ARMAMENT

As it had done in previous General Assemblies, Iraq on October 23 introduced a resolution in the First Committee entitled, "Israeli Nuclear Armament," cosponsored by 19 Arab and Islamic States. Consistent with the text of previous years' resolutions on this subject, the resolution condemned Israel's refusal to renounce its alleged possession of nuclear weapons and requested the Security Council to take urgent and effective measures to ensure that Israel complied with Security Council resolution 487 (1981), and placed all of its nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards. It expressed concern over Israel's alleged "policy of attacking and destroying nuclear facilities devoted to peaceful purposes" (preambular paragraph 10), and called on states and organizations to discontinue cooperation with Israel in the nuclear field (operative paragraph 4). It also condemned purported nuclear cooperation between Israel and South Africa (operative paragraph two), and requested the IAEA "to suspend any scientific cooperation with Israel which could contribute to its nuclear capabilities" (operative paragraph five).

On November 9 the First Committee approved the Iraqi resolution by a vote of 86 to 3 (U.S.), with 44 abstentions, and the Assembly plenary adopted it on November 30 by a vote of 97 to 2 (U.S.), with 52 abstentions. (Resolution 42/44.)

The United States objected to the overall thrust of this resolution, and especially its appeal to the IAEA to suspend nuclear cooperation with Israel. In the November 30 plenary consideration of the resolution, separate votes were taken on five of its paragraphs. On preambular paragraph seven, which recalled a resolution of the IAEA general conference calling upon Israel to place all of its nuclear facilities under safeguards, the Assembly approved retaining the paragraph by a vote of 84 to 10 (U.S.), with 37 abstentions. Separate votes were also taken on preambular paragraph 10, which was retained by 80 to 22 (U.S.), with 33 abstentions; on operative paragraph 2, which was retained by 84 to 18 (U.S.), with 37 abstentions; on operative paragraph four, which was retained by 80 to 23 (U.S.), with 36 abstentions; and on operative paragraph 5, which was retained by a vote of 83 to 22 (U.S.), with 35 abstentions.

## VERIFICATION AND COMPLIANCE

The United States has long maintained that arms control agreements are meaningless if signatories do not live up to the obligations that they have undertaken. The United States, therefore, has placed special emphasis on effective and appropriate verification and compliance provisions in arms control agreements under negotiation and on ensuring that agreements in force are being complied with fully. The United States has sought to gain broad international acceptance of the importance of these concepts of verification and compliance at UN disarmament forums.

At the 42nd General Assembly, Western countries introduced resolutions on both of those issues. Canada introduced a resolution on "Verification in All Its Aspects" in the First Committee on October 27 which was similar to its draft of the previous year. (Resolution 41/86 Q.) In its preambular paragraphs, the resolution noted some general principles of verification, e.g.:

— Disarmament and arms limitation agreements should provide for adequate and effective measures of verification. . . to create the necessary confidence and to ensure that they are being observed by all parties;

— the form and modalities of verification. . . depend upon and should be determined by the purposes, scope, and nature of the agreement;

— Verification techniques should be developed as an objective means of determining compliance with agreements and appropriately taken into account in the course of disarmament negotiations.

In its operative paragraphs, the Canadian resolution urged member states possessing verification expertise to promote the inclusion of adequate and effective verification measures in disarmament agreements. It also requested the United Nations Disarmament Commission to continue its consideration of verification at its 1988 session, with a view to the elaboration of concrete recommendations and proposals. As in 1986, the resolution was adopted without a vote in the First Committee (November 6) and by the plenary (November 30). (Resolution 42/42 F.)

On October 27 the United States introduced a resolution on "Compliance with Arms Limitation and Disarmament Agreements," which followed up on a similar resolution it had presented the previous year. (Resolution 41/59 J.) The resolution began by noting the importance of respecting the UN Charter, treaties, and other sources of international law, taking note in particular "of the fundamental importance of full implementation and strict observance of agreements on arms limitation and disarmament if individual nations and the international community are to derive enhanced security from them." It stressed that violations of such agreements thus affected the security of parties and others, and that the weakening of confidence in these agreements diminished their contribution to stability and further disarmament efforts and was therefore a matter of concern to the international community.

The operative paragraphs of the U.S. resolution urged states "to implement and comply with the entirety of the provisions" of arms limitation and disarmament agreements to which they were parties and called on all member states to give serious consideration to the implications of non-compliance. The resolution appealed to states to support efforts to resolve questions of non-compliance in order to maintain the integrity of arms control agreements and requested the Secretary General to assist member states in this regard. As in 1986, the U.S. resolution on compliance, which attracted 18 cosponsoring nations, was adopted on November 6, without a vote, in the First Committee and in the Assembly plenary, on November 30. (Resolution 42/38 M.)

## BILATERAL NUCLEAR ARMS NEGOTIATIONS

The General Assembly has passed several resolutions over the years dealing with the U.S.-Soviet negotiations on nuclear arms reductions. The resolutions generally have welcomed the conclusion of previous negotiations and urged the two participants to undertake further efforts in this field. At the 42nd General Assembly, interest in this issue was heightened in the First Committee due to the agreement in principle between the United States and the Soviet Union to work toward conclusion of the Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty and the forthcoming Washington Summit between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev. Three resolutions and one "decision" which dealt with these negotiations were adopted by the Committee.

The first resolution tabled in the 1987 session of the First Committee was a text introduced on October 13 by Romania which expressed satisfaction with the U.S.-Soviet agreement in principle to conclude a treaty to eliminate their intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles. The resolution appealed to the two governments to conclude such a treaty by the end of 1987. The United States, however, found that several formulations in the text were flawed. Romania, which was anxious to have the General Assembly issue a statement of endorsement prior to the convening of the October 22–23 U.S.-Soviet ministerial meeting in Moscow, withdrew its resolution. In its place, Romania submitted a draft "decision" which urged the Governments of the United States and the Soviet Union "to spare no effort" in concluding an INF treaty at the earliest possible date and to intensify work toward a treaty for 50 percent reductions in the two countries' strategic offensive arsenals. The Romanian "decision" was adopted by the First Committee without a vote on October 16 and by the Assembly plenary, also without a vote, on October 21. (Decision 42/407.)

As it did in previous years, the United Kingdom took the lead in drafting a resolution presenting the Western viewpoint on the bilateral talks. Introduced in the First Committee on October 16, it welcomed the U.S.-Soviet agreement to conclude a treaty to eliminate their intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles and called upon the two governments to "spare no effort" in attaining their agreed objectives in the negotiations, particularly the achievement of a 50 percent cut in their strategic offensive arms. The U.K. resolution also noted with satisfaction that President Ronald Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev had agreed to meet in Washington beginning December 7, and expressed the "firmest possible encouragement and support for the bilateral negotiations and their successful conclusion." The resolution was adopted by the First Committee on November 10 by a vote of 84 (U.S.) to 0, with 42 abstentions, and by the General Assembly on November 30 by 115 (U.S.) to 0, with 39 abstentions. (Resolution 42/38 A.)

On behalf of the non-aligned countries, Zimbabwe introduced a resolution entitled "Bilateral Nuclear-Arms Negotiations" on October 22. It welcomed the agreement in principle between the United States and the Soviet Union to sign a treaty on eliminating their intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles and to achieve progress in other areas of arms control and disarmament. The resolution also called upon the two governments to intensify their efforts to achieve agreements on strategic arms and a "nuclear-test ban," and invited them to keep the Conference on Disarmament duly informed. The text contained some language which the United States found extraneous and objectionable. The resolution was approved by the First Committee on November 10 by a vote of 116 to 0, with 13 (U.S.) abstentions. It was adopted by the plenary on November 30 by 143 to 0, with 13 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 42/38 D.)

Following the First Committee vote, the U.S. Delegation explained why it was unable to support the resolution: Although there were portions of the text which reflected the U.S. approach to the bilateral negotiations, the resolution contained certain elements which the United States found objectionable. The United States could not accept a reference in a preambular paragraph to the Harare Appeal on Disarmament adopted at the Non-Aligned Summit in 1986, which was highly critical of the United States. In addition, the resolution's appeal for a "nuclear-test ban" was inconsistent with the joint U.S.-Soviet ministerial communique which called for stage-by-stage negotiations on nuclear testing issues. The United States also found the invitation in the resolution to the two governments to keep the Conference on Disarmament duly informed of progress in the negotiations to be "wholly inappropriate, if only for procedural reasons."

On October 26 China also introduced a resolution which, although entitled "Nuclear Disarmament," was largely focused on the U.S.-Soviet negotiations. Like the other resolutions on this subject, it welcomed the agreement in principle between the two governments to conclude a treaty eliminating their intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles. The resolution further urged the United States and the Soviet Union "to negotiate in earnest with a view to reaching early agreement on the drastic reduction of their nuclear arsenals." It also stated that bilateral and multilateral efforts for nuclear disarmament should complement and facilitate each other. The First Committee approved the resolution without a vote on November 10. It was adopted by the plenary, also without a vote, on November 30. (Resolution 42/38 H.)

## NON-USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

The 42nd General Assembly, as in previous years, adopted two resolutions concerning non-use of nuclear weapons.

On October 27 India introduced a resolution in the First Committee entitled, "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons," which paralleled similar resolutions it has introduced since 1978. As in earlier resolutions, this draft criticized nuclear deterrence and declared that "the use of nuclear weapons would be a violation of the Charter of the United Nations and a crime against humanity." It requested "the Conference on Disarmament to commence negotiations . . . on an international convention prohibiting the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons under any circumstances." The resolution also incorporated the text of a proposed convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

The United States opposed the resolution on several grounds: the UN Charter provides no basis for such a declaration; it neither prohibits the use of force in self-defense nor outlaws nuclear weapons for defense or deterrence. In many parts of the world, nuclear weapons are a central part of security arrangements that have maintained peace.

On November 10 the First Committee adopted the draft resolution by a vote of 103 to 17 (U.S.), with 5 abstentions. The General Assembly plenary adopted the resolution on November 30 by a vote of 135 to 17 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions. (Resolution 42/39 C.)

On October 21 the German Democratic Republic introduced a resolution entitled, "Non-Use of Nuclear Weapons and Prevention of Nuclear War." It stated the conviction that the avoidance of nuclear war required the "renunciation of the first use of nuclear weapons" and welcomed the declarations made to this effect by two nuclear-weapon-states. The resolution appealed to those nuclear-weapon-states which have not yet done so to consider making similar declarations renouncing first use of nuclear weapons. It also requested the Conference on Disarmament to consider "the elaboration of an international instrument of a legally binding character laying down the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons." The United States opposed this resolution because the concept of non-first-use of nuclear weapons is contrary to nuclear deterrence.

On November 10 the First Committee approved the resolution by a vote of 94 to 17 (U.S.), with 10 abstentions. On November 30 the General Assembly plenary adopted the resolution by a vote of 125 to 17 (U.S.), with 12 abstentions. (Resolution 42/42 A.)

## NUCLEAR FREEZE

As in 1986, the 42nd General Assembly considered and adopted two resolutions calling for a freeze on nuclear weapons.

Mexico's resolution, introduced on October 27, was similar to the texts of previous years. The resolution urged the United States and Soviet Union to undertake an initial 5-year agreement on a nuclear-arms freeze, to be followed by more comprehensive accords which would include other nuclear-weapon states. The initial agreement called for in the resolution would establish a comprehensive ban on testing nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles, complete cessation of their manufacture, a prohibition on their further deployment, and the complete cessation of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes. Finally, the resolution called upon both the United States and the Soviet Union to submit a report to the 43rd General Assembly on the implementation of this resolution.

The resolution was adopted by the First Committee on November 9 by a vote of 114 to 13 (U.S.), with 2 abstentions. The General Assembly adopted it on November 30 by a vote of 140 to 13 (U.S.), with 2 abstentions. (Resolution 42/39 H.)

India also presented its traditional nuclear-weapons freeze resolution, on October 27, calling upon "all nuclear-weapon States to agree to a freeze on nuclear weapons, which would provide for a simultaneous total stoppage of any further production of nuclear weapons and a complete cut-off in the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes."

The First Committee adopted this resolution on November 9, by a vote of 113 to 12 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions. On November 30 the General Assembly plenary adopted the resolution by a vote of 139 to 12 (U.S.), with 4 abstentions. (Resolution 42/39 B.) The United States traditionally opposes these resolutions because a freeze on the production and testing of nuclear weapons would undermine such Western defense concepts as deterrence and flexible response.

## CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

At the 42nd General Assembly, a total of five resolutions were tabled in the First Committee on the subject of chemical and biological weapons, a reflection of the continuing concern within the international community over reports of the use and proliferation of such weapons. Several of these texts were subsequently merged, and in the end the Committee adopted and submitted to the General Assembly three resolutions on chemical and biological weapons.

As it had done at the three previous General Assemblies, the United States on October 27 once again presented a draft resolution calling for "compliance with existing international obligations regarding prohibitions on chemical and biological weapons" and condemning violations of these obligations. Building upon U.S. texts of previous years, the resolution called upon all states, pending the completion of a chemical weapons convention, "to cooperate in efforts to prevent the use of chemical weapons and in efforts to establish the facts in cases of reports of such use." The draft was eventually cosponsored by some 25 member states.

Also on October 27, Australia introduced a resolution along lines similar to the U.S. text. It went further, however, and focussed on the need for prompt and impartial investigation of reports of the use of chemical and biological weapons as a means of enhancing the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol. In its key operative paragraphs, the resolution requested the Secretary General to carry out investigations of reports of violations of the Protocol and to develop technical guidelines and procedures for such investigations. Further, it requested the Secretary General to maintain lists of qualified experts and laboratory facilities which could be used in conducting investigations. Finally, the resolution asked member states and relevant international organizations to cooperate fully with the Secretary General in these efforts.

During the course of the First Committee's work, those elements of the U.S. resolution expressing the international community's concern over reports of the use and proliferation of chemical and biological weapons and condemning violations of the 1925 Geneva Protocol were merged into the

Australian text. The revised Australian resolution was introduced in the Committee on November 9, and the United States withdrew its resolution. In doing so, the U.S. Representative, Ambassador Max L. Friedersdorf, stated:

> My Delegation is convinced that these events—the actual use of chemical weapons, and the actual proliferation of such weapons—are of such serious import that they merit condemnation in a chemical weapons resolution devoted exclusively to that end. For this reason, my Delegation was inclined to take L.71 [the U.S. resolution] to a vote. But we are mindful of and, indeed, we have strongly supported efforts to consolidate resolutions in this Committee in order to enable the Committee to concentrate better its efforts and manage its time. We have also been persuaded by assurances of other delegations, including interested Socialist and Neutral and Non-Aligned States, that the message of L.71 will not be lost in a consolidated draft.
>
> It is for this reason that my Delegation worked with other delegations to reduce the number of chemical weapons resolutions. We believe that the revised resolution, just introduced by my distinguished Australian colleague as L.67/Rev.1, reflects fully the key points initially sought by the United States in its draft resolution. In summary, it condemns the use of chemical weapons and seeks to discourage those who have done so from doing so again; it encourages nations to take appropriate action to restrict the export of chemicals with potential for use in chemical weapons; and it serves to broaden the role of and support for the Secretary General in his investigation of suspected chemical weapons use.

The revised Australian resolution was adopted by the First Committee on November 12 and by the General Assembly plenary on November 30, in both cases without a vote. (Resolution 42/37 C.)

Canada and Poland introduced a draft resolution, on October 27 in the First Committee, on the negotiations at the Conference on Disarmament on a chemical weapons convention which was similar to others introduced by the two countries and adopted by consensus over the past several years. It urged the Conference on Disarmament to intensify its negotiations on a convention to prohibit the "development, production, stockpiling, and use of all chemical weapons" during its 1988 session and to increase the amount of time that it devotes to such negotiations. The resolution was adopted without a vote in both the First Committee (November 12) and in the plenary (November 30). (Resolution 42/37 A.)

Another resolution, dealing with biological weapons and cosponsored by the United States, the Soviet Union and other states, was introduced by Austria on October 27. It recalled the work of the Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction (BWC RevCon), which took place in Geneva in September 1986. The resolution noted with satisfaction that in accordance with the RevCon's Final Declaration, an *Ad Hoc* Meeting of Scientific and Technical Experts met in March/April 1987 and adopted a report establishing the means for an exchange of information and data among parties to the Convention. The resolution, which also called upon non-adherents to join the Convention, was adopted without a vote in the First Committee (November 12) and in the plenary (November 30). (Resolution 42/37 B.)

## COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN (CTB)

In 1987 the 42nd General Assembly considered and adopted, by large majorities, four resolutions dealing with nuclear testing issues.

A resolution entitled, "Cessation of All Nuclear-Test Explosions" was introduced in the First Committee by Mexico on October 27. Describing a nuclear-test-ban treaty as a matter of the "highest priority," the resolution again called upon the members of the Conference on Disarmament at its 1988 session to establish an *Ad Hoc* committee for the multilateral negotiation of such a treaty and recommended the creation of CD working groups to deal with the contents and scope of such a treaty, and with compliance and verification. It also called upon the nuclear-weapon states to observe a moratorium on all nuclear-test explosions. The First Committee adopted this resolution on November 13 by a vote of 116 to 3 (U.S.), with 14 abstentions, and the plenary followed suit on November 30 by a vote of 137 to 3 (U.S.), with 14 abstentions. (Resolution 42/26 A.)

On October 27 Mexico introduced a second resolution under the same title as the first one. After recalling in its preamble the Limited Test Ban Treaty (LTBT) and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), as well as other international calls for measures to end the nuclear-arms race, the resolution recommended that non-nuclear-weapon states parties to the LTBT "formally submit an amendment proposal to the depository Governments [of the LTBT] with a view to convening a conference" to convert the Treaty into a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. This resolution was adopted in the First Committee on November 13 by a vote of 101 to 3 (U.S.), with 24 abstentions, and in the plenary on November 30 by a vote of 128 to 3 (U.S.), with 22 abstentions. (Resolution 42/26 B.)

The United States traditionally opposes these two resolutions because they are contrary to fundamental Western security interests for the reasons specified in the U.S. explanation of vote given on the Australia/New Zealand resolution on a Comprehensive Test Ban.

Australia and New Zealand introduced a draft resolution entitled, "Urgent Need for a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty," on October 27 on behalf of 27 cosponsors. Reaffirming that a treaty prohibiting all nuclear-test explosions was "a matter of fundamental importance," the text urged the Conference on Disarmament to "initiate substantive work on all aspects of a nuclear-test-ban treaty at the beginning of its 1988 session," and called upon the nuclear-weapon states to "agree to appropriate, verifiable interim measures" to help promote the conclusion of such a treaty. In addition, the resolution urged the CD to take steps to establish an international seismic monitoring network to assist in monitoring and verifying compliance with a test-ban treaty, taking into account progress achieved by the Group of Scientific Experts (GSE). The draft was approved in the First Committee on November 13 by a vote of 122 to 2 (U.S.), with 8 abstentions, and adopted in the plenary on November 30 by a vote of 143 to 2 (U.S.), with 8 abstentions. (Resolution 42/27.)

Following the First Committee vote, the U. S. delegation explained its negative vote on the resolution as follows:

> U.S. policy on nuclear testing issues is quite clear. We have agreed with the Soviet Union to stage-by-stage negotiations on nuclear testing issues, and these negotiations are now underway in Geneva. In these negotiations, the first step will be agreement on effective verification measures which will make it possible to ratify the U.S-U.S.S.R. Threshhold Test Ban Treaty of 1974 and the Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty of 1976. Once our verification concerns have been satisfied, and the treaties have been ratified, the President will propose that the United States and U.S.S.R. immediately enter into negotiations on ways to implement a step-by step parallel program—in association with a program to reduce and ultimately eliminate all nuclear weapons—of limiting and ultimately ending nuclear testing.
>
> The United States believes that a comprehensive nuclear test ban must be viewed in the context of a time when we do not need to depend on nuclear deterrence to ensure international security and stability, and when we have achieved broad, deep, and verifiable arms reductions, substantially improved verification capabilities, expanded confidence-building measures, and greater balance in conventional forces.
>
> We do not share the view expressed in L.77 that a comprehensive nuclear test ban is an urgent matter that should be implemented first, before substantial reductions in nuclear arsenals have been achieved and the other conditions just mentioned have been satisfied.

The fourth resolution on testing, introduced by Australia on October 22 and entitled "Notification of Nuclear Tests," called upon all states conducting nuclear explosions to provide to the UN Secretary General details regarding the timing, location and estimated yield of each explosion, within 1 week of a test. It also requested the Secretary General to present this information immediately to all member states and to submit to the General Assembly an annual register of information received on nuclear explosions. The resolution was adopted by the First Committee on November 13 by a vote of 121 to 1, with 8 (U.S.) abstentions, and by the General Assembly plenary on November 30 by a vote of 147 to 1, with 8 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 42/38 )

In explaining the U.S. abstention on this resolution, following the First Committee vote, the U.S. Delegation stated:

> The United States is unable to support Resolution L.9 and its purpose of furthering or accelerating the drive toward a comprehensive test ban. I have already described the context within which such a ban must be considered and will only urge states to work with us to make that context a reality. As is well known, the United States routinely announces information about nuclear explosions. In addition, we do not rule out the possibility of confidence-building measures that involve the reciprocal exchange of information concerning nuclear explosions. The modalities and specific context of such exchanges would need to be worked out in advance.

## CUT-OFF OF FISSIONABLE MATERIAL FOR WEAPONS PURPOSES

On October 27 Canada introduced in the First Committee a draft resolution entitled, "Prohibition of the Production of Fissionable Material for Weapons Purposes." The resolution was similar to others introduced by Canada in previous years. It considered that the "prohibition of the production of fissionable material for nuclear weapons . . . would be an important measure in facilitating the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons," as well as "a significant step towards halting and reversing the nuclear-arms race." It requested the Conference on Disarmament to pursue its consideration of the "adequately verified cessation and prohibition of the production of fissionable material for nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices."

The First Committee approved the resolution on November 9 by a vote of 125 to 1, with 6 (U.S.) abstentions. On November 30 it was adopted by the General Assembly plenary by a vote of 149 to 1, with 6 (U.S.) abstentions. The United States abstained on this resolution because the United States does not consider it realistic to pursue such negotiations in the near term due to the extreme difficulty of verifying a cutoff in the production of such materials. (Resolution 42/38 L.)

## WORLD DISARMAMENT CAMPAIGN

The World Disarmament Campaign is a Mexican initiative, stemming from the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, that calls for "mobilizing world public opinion on behalf of disarmament." The United States expressed two principal concerns when the campaign was first proposed in 1980. First, we had serious doubts that the Soviet Union and other totalitarian governments would permit any free discussion of international security or disarmament issues. Second, we noted that it was not the function of the United Nations or of governments in democratic societies to "mobilize" public opinion.

In 1982, at the second special session of the General Assembly on disarmament, the United States joined in a consensus adopting a plan for a World Disarmament Campaign. The campaign would be carried out "in all regions of the world in a balanced, factual, and objective manner." The United States has made clear its expectation that the campaign would be financed out of existing funds and voluntary contributions, and not through any increase in the UN assessed budget. Pursuant to resolution 41/60 B of 1986, the First Committee held a fifth pledging conference for the campaign on October 26, 1987, during the 42nd General Assembly; the United States did not participate.

On October 27 Mexico introduced in the First Committee a draft resolution entitled "World Disarmament Campaign." The resolution regretted that many of the states with the largest military expenditures had failed to make financial contributions to the fund for the campaign. It resolved that there should be a sixth pledging conference for the World Disarmament Campaign at the 43rd General Assembly. Finally, it requested the Secretary General, in carrying out the activities of the campaign contemplated for 1988, "to give particular attention to the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament."

The resolution was adopted by the First Committee on November 10 by a vote of 119 to 1 (U.S.), with 10 abstentions. The General Assembly plenary adopted the resolution on November 30 by a vote of 146 to 1 (U.S.), with 9 abstentions. (Resolution 42/39 G.)

Following the First Committee vote, the U.S. delegation explained its negative vote on the resolution as follows:

> Ideally, the campaign would be addressed in a procedural resolution that could be adopted by consensus. Unfortunately, the draft resolution in question continues to include objectionable language of an unrealistic and hyperbolic nature. Moreover, although, under the decision taken by the Second Special Session on Disarmament in 1982, the campaign was to be financed solely from voluntary contributions, one-third of the present funding for the campaign now comes from assessed contributions.
>
> For these reasons, the United States voted against draft resolution L.50/Rev.1. At the same time, we would express the hope that in the future, the subject of the World Disarmament Campaign will be treated in a way that would restore consensus within this Committee.

## REDUCTION OF MILITARY BUDGETS

Romania's traditional resolution, introduced on October 27, reaffirmed concern over increasing military expenditures and appealed to all states, pending the conclusion of agreements on the reduction of military expenditures, "to exercise self-restraint in their military expenditures with a view to reallocating the funds thus saved to economic and social development, particularly for the benefit of developing countries." As in previous years, the resolution called on the UN Disarmament Commission to conclude its efforts at its 1988 session to agree on a set of principles that would govern the actions of states on the reduction of military budgets.

The First Committee approved this draft resolution on November 6 without a vote, and it was similarly adopted by the General Assembly plenary on November 30. (Resolution 42/36.)

## NEW TYPES OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION

"Weapons of mass destruction" have long been defined as nuclear weapons, radiological weapons, chemical, and biological weapons, and "any weapons developed in the future which have characteristics comparable in destructive effect."

In 1975 the Soviet Union tabled a draft treaty in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) (now the Conference on Disarmament) to ban new weapons of mass destruction. At the same time, the Soviet Union was also the principal sponsor in the General Assembly of a resolution calling on the CCD to undertake negotiations on this treaty. In subsequent years the Soviet Union and its allies have continued to call for such negotiations in resolutions presented at both the CD and the General Assembly.

The U.S. position, shared by many of its allies, is that for an agreement to be effective and verifiable it must address specific weapons as they emerge, rather than treat unknown weapons in general terms. A treaty as proposed by the Soviet Union would be purely hortatory and would depend solely on good faith, a conceptual approach rejected by the United States and other countries.

On October 27 the Byelorussian S.S.R. introduced a draft resolution entitled, "Prohibition of the Development and Manufacture of New Types of Weapons of Mass Destruction and New Systems of Such Weapons." The resolution reaffirmed "the necessity of prohibiting the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons." It requested the Conference on Disarmament to keep under review the question of prohibiting the development and manufacture of such weapons with a view to undertaking negotiations. It also urged all states to refrain from any action that could adversely affect efforts to prevent the emergence of these weapons or weapon systems. Finally, the resolution requested the CD to submit a report to the 43rd General Assembly for its consideration.

The First Committee approved the Byelorussian resolution on November 11 by a vote of 106 to 1 (U.S.), with 18 abstentions. It was adopted in plenary on November 30 by a vote of 135 to 1 (U.S.), with 18 abstentions. (Resolution 42/35.)

## NEGATIVE SECURITY ASSURANCES

Non-nuclear-weapon states have long sought guarantees from the nuclear-weapon states that, in exchange for their renunciation of nuclear arms, the nuclear-weapon states would not use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against them. These guarantees have been referred to as "negative security assurances." During the First Special Session on Disarmament in 1978, each of the five nuclear-weapon states, in an effort to meet the concerns of the non-nuclear-weapon states, issued a unilateral statement offering some form of negative security assurance. Secretary of State Vance made the following statement on behalf of the President:

> The United States will not use nuclear weapons against any non-nuclear-weapon state party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty or any comparable internationally binding commitment not to acquire nuclear explosive devices, except in the case of an attack on the United States, its territories or armed forces, or its allies, by such a state allied to a nuclear-weapon state or associated with a nuclear-weapon state in carrying out or sustaining the attack.

Since 1982, an *Ad Hoc* committee has addressed the question of negative security assurances at the Conference on Disarmament. It has, however, been unable to reach agreement on effective international arrangements.

The United States is a signatory to Protocol II of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which is intended to provide security assurances by nuclear-weapon states to members of the Latin American nuclear-weapon-free zone. While pointing out that the U.S. assurances stand as a reliable and valid statement of U.S. policy, the United States has also indicated its willingness to discuss the possibility of developing a single form of negative security assurance that would both safeguard the security requirements of each of the nuclear-weapon states and their allies, and meet the desires of all non-nuclear-weapon states.

As in previous years, Pakistan and Bulgaria each sponsored resolutions on negative security assurances in the First Committee at the 42nd General Assembly. The Pakistani resolution, introduced on October 20 and entitled, "Conclusion of Effective International Arrangements To Assure Non-Nuclear-Weapon States Against the Use or Threat of Use of Nuclear Weapons," was along lines similar to its drafts of previous years. It reaffirmed "the urgent need to reach agreement on effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon states against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons." The resolution appealed to all states, especially the nuclear-weapon states, to demonstrate "political will" to reach agreement on a "common formula which could be included in an international instrument of a legally binding character." In addition, the Pakistani text recommended that the Conference on Disarmament actively continue negotiations toward reaching such an agreement on negative security assurances.

The United States abstained on Pakistan's resolution, on the grounds that the feasibility of reaching effective international arrangements depended on more than just the political will of states. On November 9 the First Committee adopted the draft resolution by a vote of 122 to 0, with 3 (U.S.) abstentions. The General Assembly plenary on November 30 adopted the resolution by a vote of 151 to 0, with 3 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 42/32.)

Bulgaria's resolution, introduced on October 26, was quite similar to that introduced by Pakistan. It noted that unconditional guarantees of non-first use by all nuclear-weapon states "would be tantamount in practice to banning the use of nuclear weapons against all states, including all non-nuclear-weapon states." The text also requested that the Conference on Disarmament continue active negotiations on this subject and that an *Ad Hoc* committee be reestablished to promote such negotiations.

The Bulgarian resolution endorsed several concepts, such as non-first-use of nuclear weapons, which run contrary to United States policy; therefore, the United States voted against the resolution. The draft resolution was adopted in the First Committee on November 9 by a vote of 87 to 18 (U.S.), with 15 abstentions. On November 30 the General Assembly plenary adopted the resolution by a vote of 112 to 18 (U.S.), with 20 abstentions. (Resolution 42/31.)

## NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONES

The concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) dates back to the 1950's, and remains today a potentially effective regional approach to non-proliferation.

### Protocol I of the Treaty of Tlatelolco

The most significant NWFZ agreement to date is the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which entered into force in 1968 and which, by means of two protocols, provides for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin America. Protocol I, which is open to adherence by non-Latin American states that administer territory within the over 7.5 million-square-mile area, provides that these states will not store or deploy nuclear weapons within those territories. Protocol II, which is open to adherence by nuclear-weapon states, provides that these states will not contribute to acts involving a violation of the Treaty. The United States signed Protocol I in May 1977, and ratified it in November 1981. The United States signed Protocol II in April 1968, and ratified it in May 1971. This treaty and Additional Protocol I, in particular, have been the subject of a series of UN resolutions urging ratification by all concerned states.

On October 27 Mexico tabled its traditional resolution in the First Committee concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol I of the Treaty of Tlatelolco. Cosponsored by some 15 Latin American nations, the resolution recognized that there are some territories which, in spite of not being sovereign political entities, are nevertheless in a position to receive the benefits derived from the Treaty through its Additional Protocol I, to which the four states that *de jure* or *de facto* are internationally responsible for those territories may become parties. It recalled that three of those states, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and the United States, became parties to Additional Protocol I in 1969, 1971, and 1981, respectively. Deploring the fact that France has not yet ratified the Protocol, the resolution once again urged France to do so without delay.

The First Committee approved Mexico's resolution on November 9 by a vote of 127 (U.S.) to 0, with 6 abstentions. It was adopted in plenary on November 30 by a vote of 147 (U.S.) to 0, with 7 abstentions (Resolution 42/25.)

Following the First Committee vote, the U. S. Delegation issued the following statement:

> The United States is a strong, long-time supporter of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, and we have voted for the resolution L.52 which the Delegation of Mexico put forward on the subject. I would like to offer, however, an observation on the resolution and on the Treaty of Tlatelolco.
>
> The resolution that has just been adopted singles out the one country eligible to join Tlatelolco's Additional Protocol I that has not yet done so. At the same time, there are

> states in the region that are eligible to join the Tlatelolco Treaty, for which the Treaty is not in force. Moreover, some of these states are developing sensitive nuclear technologies outside of international safeguards.
>
> The resolution that has been adopted states that it is not fair that the peoples of certain territories in the nuclear free zone are deprived of the benefits of denuclearization available to them under Protocol I. Is it any less fair to the regional states that have brought the Tlatelolco Treaty into force not to have legally-binding, concrete, and verifiable assurances that their neighbors' nuclear activities are dedicated exclusively to peaceful purposes? We do not think so.
>
> We would urge those states that have not yet brought the Treaty and Protocol I into force to do so. For only when the Treaty of Tlatelolco and its Protocols are in force for all eligible states can it make its full contribution to regional and hemisphere security.

## African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone

Since 1961, resolutions have been introduced in the First Committee calling for the designation of Africa as a nuclear-weapon-free zone. In 1987 two resolutions were introduced in the First Committee concerning nuclear issues and Africa. The first resolution, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration (on the Denuclearization of Africa)," was introduced by Madagascar on October 27. The resolution regretted the inability of the United Nations Disarmament Commission to reach consensus on the denuclearization of Africa and called upon all states to respect the continent and its surrounding areas as a nuclear-weapon-free zone. It expressed "grave alarm at South Africa's possession and continued development of nuclear-weapon capability" and condemned it for these actions. The resolution demanded that South Africa submit its nuclear installations and facilities to inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency, and appealed "to all states that have the means to do so to monitor South Africa's research on and development and production of nuclear weapons and to publicize any information in that regard." Finally, it requested the Secretary General to assist the Organization of African Unity in its efforts to implement the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa.

The resolution was adopted in First Committee on November 11, by a vote of 129 to 0, with 4 (U.S.) abstentions. The General Assembly plenary adopted the resolution on November 30, by a vote of 151 to 0, with 4 (U.S.) abstentions. The United States abstained on this resolution because of its presumption that South Africa possesses a nuclear-weapons capability. (Resolution 42/34 A.)

The second resolution, entitled "Nuclear Capability of South Africa," also was introduced by Madagascar on October 27. The resolution condemned "all forms of nuclear collaboration by any state, corporation, institution, or individual with the racist regime of South Africa, in particular the decision by some member states to grant licenses to several corporations in their territories to provide equipment and technical and maintenance services for nuclear installations in South Africa." In addition, it specifically mentioned that "certain Western states and Israel" have continued to collaborate with South Africa in the military and nuclear fields. It also condemned "the massive buildup of South Africa's military machine, in particular its frenzied acquisition of nuclear-weapon capability for repressive and aggressive purposes and as an instrument of blackmail." Finally, the resolution commended the Security Council for its examination of ways and means of tightening the arms embargo so as to prohibit all forms of cooperation with South Africa in the nuclear field.

The resolution was adopted in the First Committee on November 9, by a vote of 113 to 4 (U.S.), with 14 abstentions. The plenary adopted the resolution on November 30, by a recorded vote of 140 to 4 (U.S.), with 13 abstentions. The United States voted against this resolution because of its reference to "certain Western States and Israel" purportedly engaging in military and nuclear collaboration with South Africa. (Resolution 42/34 B.)

**Middle East Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone**

As it had done at previous General Assemblies, Egypt introduced its traditional resolution on "Establishment of a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in the Region of the Middle East" in the First Committee on October 21. The resolution invited "the countries concerned to adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons" (NPT) and called upon all countries of the region to place all their nuclear activities under IAEA safeguards. It also invited countries of the region, pending establishment of the zone, "not to develop, produce, test or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons or permit the stationing on their territories, or territories under their control, of nuclear weapons or nuclear explosives devices." Finally, the resolution invited the nuclear-weapon states "to refrain from any action that runs counter to both the letter and spirit" of the resolution.

The United States has supported this resolution since its first version was introduced in 1974. It was adopted by the First Committee without a vote on November 9; the General Assembly plenary also adopted it without a vote on November 30. (Resolution 42/28.)

Following the Committee's action, the U.S. Delegation delivered the following explanation of the U.S. position on this resolution:

> The U. S. Delegation was pleased to have joined in the consensus adoption of resolution L.8, concerning the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons in the Middle East.
>
> Resolution L.8 contains a preambular paragraph that emphasizes the need for appropriate measures on the question of the prohibition of military attacks on nuclear facilities . . . Regarding the general question of the prohibition of military attacks on nuclear facilities...I would like to take this occasion to note that the nuclear facilities of nations at peace are protected by the provisions of the UN Charter concerning the use of force; and that when nations are engaged in active hostilities, longstanding laws and customs of war prohibit attacks against facilities which are not legitimate military

**objectives, as well as attacks which would cause disproportionate civilian casualties. In our view, states should comply with existing international obligations. We continue to believe that the question of additional legal protection against attacks on nuclear facilities should be considered separately from the question of a ban on radiological weapons.**

### South Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone

This traditional Pakistani resolution dates back to 1974. Pakistan's text in 1987, introduced on October 27 and cosponsored by Bangladesh, was along lines similar to those of previous years. It reaffirmed the concept of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia and urged the states of South Asia to continue efforts toward its establishment. Additionally, the resolution requested states in the region to avoid actions contrary to this objective and called for positive actions by the nuclear-weapon-states and the Secretary General in furtherance of a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

The United States has traditionally supported this resolution. It was adopted by the First Committee on November 9 by a vote of 95 (U.S.) to 3, with 33 abstentions and by the General Assembly on November 30 by a vote of 114 (U.S.) to 3, with 36 abstentions. (Resolution 42/29.)

## INDIAN OCEAN ZONE OF PEACE

General Assembly resolution 2832 (1971), which contained a Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a "zone of peace," called for the great powers to remove their naval forces and facilities from the Indian Ocean. Subsequent annual resolutions endorsed the 1971 Declaration and established an *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Indian Ocean* to consider its implementation. The United States has made clear from the beginning its reservations about the 1971 terms of reference for the deliberations concerning the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

In 1980, the United States, together with other Permanent Members of the Security Council and major maritime nations, accepted the invitation of littoral and hinterland states of the region to join the *Ad Hoc* committee. Since that time, we have attempted to point out the anomaly of trying to restrict naval forces in the region while ignoring land-based forces, such as those of the Soviet Union now occupying Afghanistan, a hinterland state of the Indian Ocean. We also have consistently opposed the convening of a conference on the Indian Ocean until there were indications that it could be successful. So long as conditions of peace and security do not prevail in the littoral and hinterland states, and there is no agreement on the basic principles that should govern an Indian Ocean Zone of Peace, the United States believes that such a conference would be premature.

---

*Its 49 members in 1987 were Australia, Bangladesh, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, German Democratic Republic, Federal Republic of Germany, Greece, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritius, Mozambique, Netherlands, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Poland, Romania, Seychelles, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tanzania, Thailand, Uganda, U.S.S.R., United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States, Yemen (Aden), Yemen (Sanaa), Yugoslavia, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

During First Committee consideration of the Indian Ocean Zone of Peace at the 38th General Assembly, the traditional consensus procedure for dealing with this item was broken when the Eastern nations called for a roll-call vote on two operative paragraphs of the Indian Ocean resolution. The United States then made it clear that it would abstain from participation in the *Ad Hoc* committee until the consensus procedure was reestablished. Following consultations with members, the committee chairman stated during the July 1984 session that "all delegations have agreed that decisions in matters affecting the Indian Ocean are taken by consensus." On this understanding, the United States took its seat again and has participated in *Ad Hoc* committee meetings since 1984.

On October 27, Sri Lanka, as chairman of the *Ad Hoc* committee, introduced in the First Committee a draft resolution which the Committee had adopted by consensus in July. After renewing the mandate of the *Ad Hoc* committee, it requested the Committee to complete preparatory work during its forthcoming sessions "in order to enable the convening of the Conference [on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace] in Colombo at an early date, but not later than 1990." The resolution also requested the *Ad Hoc* committee to hold three 1-week sessions in 1988, "one session of which could be held at Colombo in accordance with a decision to be taken by the *Ad Hoc* ommittee at its first session in 1988." This draft resolution was approved without a vote in the First Committee on November 16, and adopted in a similar manner by the Assembly plenary on November 30. (Resolution 42/43.)

## SOUTH ATLANTIC ZONE OF PEACE

At the 41st General Assembly in 1986, Brazil and a number of African and Latin American cosponsors introduced for the first time a resolution in the Assembly plenary, without reference to a main committee, calling for the declaration of a "Zone of Peace and Cooperation of the South Atlantic," to be established "in the region situated between Africa and South America." The text called upon all states, "in particular the militarily significant ones," to respect the zone, "especially through the reduction and eventual elimination of their military presence there, the nonintroduction of nuclear weapons, and other weapons of mass destruction, and the nonextension into the region of rivalries and conflicts that are foreign to it." The resolution also affirmed that the elimination of Apartheid and the independence of Namibia were essential for peace and security in the South Atlantic region, and urged the implementation of all UN resolutions dealing with Apartheid.

The South Atlantic resolution was adopted by the General Assembly by a vote of 124 to 1 (U.S.), with 8 abstentions. (Resolution 41/11.) The United States opposed this resolution for a variety of reasons. Primary among these was its implication that restrictions should be placed on naval access to and activity in the South Atlantic Ocean. The United States regards such restrictions as being inconsistent with the generally recognized principles under international law of the freedom of navigation on the high seas and the right of innocent passage through territorial waters.

At the 42nd General Assembly, Brazil again took the lead, on behalf of some 22 cosponsors, in introducing in the General Assembly plenary on November 10 a draft resolution on this subject. Largely procedural in nature, the text recalled the original resolution adopted in 1986 and urged that the states of the region continue to seek to implement the declaration of the South Atlantic as a zone of peace and cooperation by carrying out concrete programs to this end. The resolution called upon all states to cooperate in promoting the objectives of the zone and to refrain from any actions which could "create or aggravate situations of tension and potential conflict in the region." It also requested the relevant organs and bodies of the United Nations to assist the states of the South Atlantic region in their efforts to implement the declaration. On November 10 the plenary adopted the Brazilian resolution by a vote of 122 to 1 (U.S.), with 8 abstentions. (Resolution 42/16.)

In explaining the negative U.S. vote, U.S. Alternate Representative Mark Siljander stated the following:

> When the United States voted against resolution 41/11 on this subject at the 41st United Nations General Assembly last year, my Delegation explained what we regarded as serious defects in the text which required our opposition. These views are well known and need not be repeated here. I will confine my remarks to the observation that the United States does not accept the premise that an internationally recognized zone of peace can be created by means of a resolution of the UN General Assembly, rather than as the result of multilateral negotiations.

## DISARMAMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

The question of a relationship between disarmament and development was first considered at the First Special Session on Disarmament (SSOD-I) in 1978 and has been the subject of General Assembly resolutions in recent years. In 1983, at the initiative of President Mitterrand of France, the Assembly adopted a resolution which placed the issue on the UN Disarmament Commission's 1984 agenda. The 39th General Assembly adopted a resolution, introduced by France, which decided to convene an international conference on the relationship between disarmament and development in 1986 and which also established a 54-member Preparatory Committee (PrepCom). Although the United States joined in the consensus adoption of this resolution, it did not participate in the work of the PrepCom when it first met in August 1985, because of skepticism about the value of the proposed conference.

In 1985 the 40th General Assembly adopted a resolution that recommended acceptance of a provisional agenda submitted by the Preparatory Committee for the conference and set 1986 as the year for convening the conference in Paris. The United States decided in April 1986 that it would not attend the conference because they did not accept the premise that there is necessarily a causal relationship between disarmament and development. Two months later, in response to a request by France, the resumed session of the 40th General Assembly formally deferred the conference until 1987.

In accordance with a decision adopted without a vote by the 41st General Assembly in 1986, the International Conference on the Relationship Between Disarmament and Development was held at UN Headquarters in New York from August 24 to September 11. Consistent with its policy decision of April 1986, the United States did not participate in the Assembly's adoption of this "decision," nor did it participate in the conference itself. The conference adopted a "final document" and a program of action which ran counter to several aspects of U.S. policy.

At the 42nd General Assembly, India, on behalf of the non-aligned countries, and France, on behalf of the West, circulated draft resolutions addressing the outcome of the conference on disarmament and development. These were eventually merged into a single text which was submitted to the First Committee on October 27. The Franco-Indian resolution welcomed the adoption of the "final document" by the conference and requested the Preparatory Committee for the Third Special Session on Disarmament (SSOD III) to include on the agenda of the Special Session an item entitled, "Relationship between disarmament and development, in the light of the action program adopted at the International Conference." The resolution also requested the Secretary General "to take action through the appropriate organs, within available resources, for the implementation of the action program as adopted at the International Conference."

Not only does the United States not accept the basic premise of a purported relationship between disarmament and development, but also the United States was particularly troubled by the resolution's request to the Secretary General to take steps to implement the conference's program of action. Prior to the First Committee's consideration of and action on the Franco-Indian resolution, the U.S. Delegation declared that the United States was not participating in this action, as follows:

> The U.S. Delegation wishes to announce that we will not participate in whatever action the First Committee will take on draft resolution L.74.
>
> As everyone knows, the United States believes that disarmament and development are two distinct issues that cannot be considered appropriately in terms of an interrelationship between these two disparate subjects.
>
> Consequently, the United States declined to participate in the recent international conference on this matter, and has refrained from participating in both the drafting of L.74 and the subsequent debate in this committee.
>
> For these reasons, the U.S. Delegation requests that the permanent record of today's proceedings reflect the fact that the United States has not participated in the consideration of draft resolution L.74. At the same time, our Delegation takes this opportunity to state

**that the U.S. Government does not and will not consider itself bound or committed in any way by either the declarations in the "final document" of the recent international conference or the terms of draft resolution L.74.**

The First Committee approved the resolution without a vote on November 16. Prior to consideration of this item in the General Assembly plenary on November 30, the United States repeated the statement of the U.S. position. The Assembly adopted the resolution without a vote. (Resolution 42/45.)

## COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM OF DISARMAMENT

For the past several years an *Ad Hoc* committee of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva has been negotiating a draft document on a Comprehensive Program of Disarmament (CPD). The 40th General Assembly adopted by consensus the traditional Mexican resolution that urged the Conference to continue its work on the draft during 1986, with a view toward completing the document in time for submission to the 41st General Assembly.

At the 41st UN General Assembly, Mexico introduced in the First Committee a draft "decision" by which the CPD agenda item would be kept open "in order to allow the Conference on Disarmament to conclude the elaboration of a comprehensive program of disarmament during the first part of its 1987 session and to submit a complete draft of the program to the (41st) General Assembly at that time." The First Committee and the plenary adopted this "decision" without a vote.

By the time of the 42nd General Assembly, the CD had not yet completed its work on the CPD. Mexico again took the lead in introducing a resolution on this subject in the First Committee on October 27. It regretted that the Conference on Disarmament was unable to complete the elaboration of the Comprehensive Program of Disarmament in time to submit a finished draft to the General Assembly prior to the conclusion of its 41st session. The resolution urged the CD to resume its work on the CPD at the outset of its 1988 session, "with a view to resolving outstanding issues," so that the Conference could submit a completed draft to the General Assembly at its Third Special Session on Disarmament (SSOD III).

The Mexican resolution was adopted by the First Committee on November 6 and by the General Assembly plenary on November 30, in both cases without a vote. (Resolution 42/42 I.)

## CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES AND THE CDE

In the wake of the successful conclusion in September 1986 of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe (CDE), a total of five draft resolutions were tabled in the 42nd General Assembly's First Committee dealing in one aspect or another with the Stockholm Conference, confidence- and security-building measures, openness in military matters, and conventional disarmament. Ultimately, four of these resolutions were withdrawn.

The only resolution dealing with confidence- and security-building measures which the First Committee acted upon was the draft submitted on October 27 by the Federal Republic of Germany, in a follow-up to its resolution on this subject (41/60 C) at the 41st General Assembly. It noted with satisfaction that the concept of confidence-building as a means of strengthening international peace and security and of promoting disarmament had met with growing acceptance among states. The resolution requested the UN Disarmament Commission to seek to finalize at its 1988 session a set of "guidelines for appropriate types of confidence-building measures and for the implementation of such measures on a global or regional level."

The resolution was adopted by the First Committee on November 6 and by the General Assembly plenary on November 30, in both cases without a vote. (Resolution 42/39 F.)

## INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES

The 42nd General Assembly and its First Committee considered several initiatives of a largely institutional nature. On October 27 Nigeria introduced its traditional resolution on the UN program of disarmament fellowships. An essentially procedural resolution, it recalled and reaffirmed the decision of the Second Special Session on Disarmament (SSOD II) to increase the number of fellowships from 20 to 25, and renamed the program as the "United Nations disarmament fellowship, training and advisory services program." The resolution asked the Secretary General to implement the combined program within existing resources and also expressed appreciation to those governments, such as the United States, which had hosted the disarmament fellows in 1987. The resolution was adopted in the First Committee on November 10 by a vote of 129 to 1 (U.S.), with 0 abstentions. It was approved by the General Assembly on November 30 by a vote of 156 to 1 (U.S.), with 0 abstentions. (Resolution 42/39 I.)

The U.S. Representative explained that the United States had cast the sole negative vote with great regret. Although the United States strongly supports the disarmament fellows program, it could not approve the additional expenditures associated with the implementation of expanded programs because of their financial implications.

The United Kingdom tabled a resolution on UN disarmament studies on October 27. The draft reaffirmed the value of such studies and took note of the conclusion of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Studies that consensus should be the normal practice in study groups, but that the expression of differing views within such groups should be permitted. The resolution was adopted by the First Committee on November 11 and by the plenary on

November 30, in both cases without a vote. (Resolution 42/42 J.)

In 1985 the 40th General Assembly adopted a resolution calling for the establishment of a UN Regional Center for Peace and Disarmament in Africa. The Center was inaugurated in Lome, Togo on October 24, 1986. In a follow-up action, Madagascar introduced a resolution on October 27 in the Committee which welcomed the inauguration of the Center and requested the Secretary General to furnish it with "all necessary support." The text also appealed to states and nongovernmental organizations to make contributions to the Center. The resolution was approved by the First Committee on November 10 and by the General Assembly on November 30, in both cases by consensus. (Resolution 42/39 J.)

In 1986 the 41st General Assembly adopted a resolution calling for the establishment of a UN Regional Center for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America. The Center was inaugurated on October 9, 1987, in Lima, Peru. At the 42nd General Assembly, Peru introduced a follow-up resolution in the First Committee on October 27 which welcomed the inauguration of the Center and called upon states and nongovernmental organizations to make contributions to it. The resolution also recommended that the Lima Center hold a conference of experts in 1988 on strengthening peace, disarmament, development, and security in Latin America under the World Disarmament Campaign. The First Committee adopted the Peruvian resolution without a vote on November 10; the General Assembly also approved it without a vote on November 30. (Resolution 42/39 K.)

Following the November 10 First Committee votes on the two regional centers, the U.S. Delegation explained the U.S. position as follows:

> As delegations are aware, the United States engages in and supports regional approaches to arms limitations. Our Delegation has demonstrated that support by joining in the consensus adoption of draft resolutions L.62 and L.72/Rev. 1 concerning the UN regional centers for disarmament in Africa and Latin America, respectively.
>
> The United States has been able to support these draft resolutions on the understanding that they call for the regional centers to function solely on the basis of existing resources and of voluntary contributions from member states.
>
> The United States takes this opportunity, however, to underscore its concern that these draft resolutions are, nevertheless, resulting in an expansion of the physical plant of the United Nations during a period of fiscal austerity. Our Delegation, therefore, wishes to express its hope that, when the Secretariat reports to this committee on the activities of these centers next year, those reports will show financial contributions to the centers from the governments of the interested regions at a level commensurate with the political support that they have demonstrated on these draft resolutions today.

The 42nd General Assembly also established a third regional center as a result of a resolution from the First Committee. On October 27 Nepal introduced a draft resolution which called for the setting up of a UN Regional Center for Peace and Disarmament in Asia. It provided that the Center would be located in Kathmandu, Nepal. The resolution requested the Secretary

General to take the necessary administrative steps to support the creation and functioning of the Center, including the "utilization of the existing UN infrastructure at Kathmandu with a view to the full employment of available resources." It also invited member states and interested organizations to make voluntary contributions to the Asian Center.

The resolution was adopted without a vote by the First Committee on November 12 and by the General Assembly plenary, also without a vote, on November 30. (Resolution 42/39 D.)

In joining this consensus in the First Committee, the U.S. Delegation stated that United States views on establishing UN regional peace and disarmament centers contained in its explanation of vote of November 10 on the African and Latin American Centers applied to the Asian Center as well.

Also of an institutional nature was Iraq's resolution, introduced on October 26, which reiterated "the right of all states not members of the Conference on Disarmament to participate in the work of the plenary sessions of the Conference on substantive questions." It was adopted in the First Committee on November 13 by a vote of 103 to 1, with 13 (U.S.) abstentions. The General Assembly plenary adopted the resolution on November 30 by a vote of 137 to 1, with 14 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 42/42 B.)

As it had done in previous years, Yugoslavia on October 27 tabled a resolution on the annual report of the Conference on Disarmament. Rather than being a merely procedural text designed to take note of the report, the resolution again contained anti-Western rhetoric and urged the Conference to undertake substantive negotiations on various disarmament questions which the United States does not consider appropriate for multilateral negotiation, such as on a nuclear-test ban. The resolution was approved by the First Committee on November 13 by a vote of 104 to 5 (U.S.), with 14 abstentions. It was adopted in plenary on November 30 by a vote of 135 to 5 (U.S.), with 15 abstentions. (Resolution 42/42 L.)

On behalf of a number of Western countries, the Netherlands on October 27 introduced a competing resolution on the same subject. Largely procedural in nature, the resolution took note of the report of the 1987 session of the CD and asked the Conference to submit a report on its work in 1988 to the 43rd General Assembly. However, it also contained several formulations, such as the assertion that the CD should play a central role in implementing the Action Program in the Final Document of the First Special Session on Disarmament (SSOD I), which the United States considered to be extraneous to what was intended to be a purely procedural resolution. Accordingly, the United States abstained. The resolution was adopted in the First Committee on November 13 by a vote of 87 to 0, with 32 (U.S.) abstentions, and in the plenary on November 30 by a vote of 127 to 0, with 28 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 42/42 K.)

Following the First Committee votes on the two resolutions on the CD report, the U.S. Delegation explained its reservations in the following statement:

> My Delegation has often expressed its view that, because the CD report is a consensus document, and because the resolution presenting that report to the UN General Assembly should foster a spirit of cooperation, instead of airing old controversies, the resolution should be a simple, business-like document, free of polemics and partisan views. In keeping with its unfortunate tradition, however, the resolution bearing the number L.69 this year attempts to superimpose the views of certain states on what was collectively developed and agreed upon by consensus among the participants in the Conference on Disarmament. As a result, this resolution remains a Christmas tree adorned with all sorts of garish, discordant, and inappropriate ornaments.
>
> Turning to the other CD report resolution, my Delegation deeply regrets that we could not support L.61/Rev.1. Its sponsors have taken a much more constructive approach to this matter, and it is noteworthy that many of those supporting resolution L.69 did not see fit to support resolution L.61/Rev.1. From the standpoint of the United States, resolution L.61/Rev.1. is by far more appropriate than the other one. Unfortunately, it still falls short of our goal of a strictly procedural resolution. For that reason, my Delegation felt compelled to abstain on it.

Another institutional resolution was one introduced by Bulgaria on October 27 which took note of the report of the 1987 session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission and requested the Commission to continue its work in 1988 in accordance with its mandate and "to make every effort to achieve specific recommendations . . . on the outstanding items on its agenda," and to submit a special report on its work in 1988 to the Third Special Session on Disarmament. It was adopted by the First Committee on November 6 and by the plenary on November 30, in both instances without a vote. (Resolution 42/42 G.)

## Antarctica

In resolution 38/77 of December 15, 1983, the General Assembly requested the Secretary General to prepare a study on all aspects of Antarctica, taking into account the Antarctic Treaty system and other relevant factors. He was also to seek the views of member states and of those conducting scientific research in Antarctica, and to request assistance from other interested states and specialized agencies, as well as from organizations with scientific or technical information on Antarctica. The resulting report, which was submitted to the General Assembly in October 1984, reviewed a range of activities related to Antarctica without making any major recommendations. On December 17, 1984, General Assembly resolution 39/152 expressed appreciation to the Secretary General for the study, and placed Antarctica on the provisional agenda of the 40th session.

Consideration of Antarctica by the General Assembly at its 40th session led to a regrettable polarization of views on the issue, with non-Antarctic Treaty members pressing for fundamental changes in the Antarctic Treaty system, and Treaty parties rejecting the alleged need for significant alterations in the system. Debate in the First Committee resulted in the adoption of three resolutions by vote for the first time, contrary to the traditional consideration of Antarctica under the rule of consensus. Beyond these, Malaysia and other developing states also proposed the establishment of a UN *Ad Hoc* committee to consider Antarctic issues, but did not press for a vote on this issue.

Prior to the Antarctica votes at the 40th session, Australia announced on behalf of the United States and the other Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties that they viewed the breaking of consensus on this matter with regret because consensus had formed the basis for past cooperation by the parties with non-member states and with the United Nations. Since the Consultative Parties were not prepared to accept attempts to undermine the Antarctic Treaty system, which remains open for accession by all nations, the parties declared they would not participate in voting on Antarctica resolutions in either the First Committee or the General Assembly plenary until consensus, the only realistic basis for United Nations consideration of the matter, was restored. Australia further stated on behalf of the Parties that they would suspend their cooperation with the United Nations on Antarctic matters until consensus was achieved again. This course of action continued in the 41st and 42nd sessions.

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

The solidarity of countries supporting this position was maintained at the 1987 session, although some Antarctic Treaty countries supported the resolution that called for the exclusion of South Africa from the Antarctic Treaty.

Two resolutions on Antarctica were adopted by the 42nd General Assembly. The first called upon the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties to invite the Secretary General or his Representative to all meetings of the Treaty Parties, including consultative meetings and the mineral resources negotiations, and requested the Secretary General to submit a report of his evaluation of these meetings to the 43rd General Assembly. The resolution called upon the Consultative Parties to suspend negotiations on the mineral resources regime until such time as all members of the international community could participate fully in the negotiations. It also urged all member states to cooperate with the Secretary General and to continue consultations on all aspects relating to Antarctica. This resolution was adopted in the First Committee on November 18 by a vote of 73 to 0, vith 10 abstentions and 42 (U.S.) not participating in the vote. The General Asembly plenary adopted the resolution on November 30 by a vote of 100 to 0, vith 10 abstentions and 44 states (U.S.) not participating. (Resolution 42/46 B.)

The second resolution called upon the Consultative Parties to exclude South Africa from their meetings because of its policy of Apartheid. This resolution was adopted in the First Committee on November 18 by a vote of 96 to 0, with 7 abstentions and 22 (U.S.) not participating. It was approved by the plenary on November 30 by a vote of 122 to 0, with 9 abstentions and 3 (U.S.)

not participating. (Resolution 42/46 A.)

Prior to the November 18 vote on Resolution 42/46 B in the First Committee, Australia, speaking on behalf of all the Antarctic Treaty Consultative and Non-Consultative Parties, expressed the Parties' misgivings about the value of debates in the United Nations on the Antarctic Treaty system. Australia rebutted the criticisms which have been directed by some members at the Treaty, and highlighted the accomplishments of the Treaty system. The Parties found it unfortunate and regrettable that the General Assembly's consideration of Antarctica had departed from the traditional pattern of consensus in recent years. Australia concluded by stating that the Treaty Parties remain willing to display flexibility and to negotiate a return to consensus in the UN consideration of Antarctica, but not at what they regard as the cost of the possible erosion of the successful functioning of the Antarctic Treaty system.

## Outer Space

### UNITED NATIONS COMMITTEE ON THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE (COPUOS)

The 53-member COPUOS, its Scientific and Technical Subcommittee, and its Legal Subcommittee all met during 1987. For several decades after its inception in 1958, the Committee worked successfully in the exchange of scientific information and negotiated four widely accepted conventions that form the basis of international space law. However, the scientific and legal work of the Committee has deteriorated seriously in recent years with debates becoming increasingly political. There has been a tendency to involve the Committee in disarmament and other matters that the United States and other Western nations believe are fundamentally at odds with the Committee's mandate and with the consensus procedure that governs its work.

COPUOS met for its 30th session in June. The West continued to press for the adoption of measures to revitalize COPUOS and its Subcommittees. A working paper was put forward by the West and was met with the same unreconstructed attitude of the East toward strengthening the Committee. As an alternative, the U.S.S.R. once again proposed setting up a new bureaucratic structure, otherwise known as the World Space Organization.

#### Scientific and Technical Subcommittee

In February the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee considered new items first proposed in a working paper sponsored by Australia, Belgium, Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, Portugal, the Netherlands, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and the United States, in the fields of space science, planetary exploration, and astronomy. Largely at the instigation of the West, the Subcommittee decided also to focus in 1988 on the practical applications of remote sensing and satellite communications technologies of particular relevance to the needs of developing countries. These were useful steps toward strengthening the scientific content of the Subcommittee's work which will keep member states abreast of new knowledge gained in space exploration. A Working Group of the Whole met for the first time to consider improving the execution of activities of the Program on Space Applications and to evaluate the implementation of the recommendations of the UNISPACE '82 Conference. Considerable progress was made in focusing attention on measures which will strengthen the existing structure for carrying out the work recommended by the Conference. At the same time, the Subcommittee rejected a proposal by the U.S.S.R. to establish an international space agency which would, in practice, replace the existing COPUOS structure and deal primarily with disarmament issues.

**Legal Subcommittee**

The 26th session of the Legal Subcommittee met in New York in March. The agenda included the definition and delimitation of outer space, the rational and equitable use of the geostationary orbit, and the use of nuclear power sources in space; however, the Subcommittee spent much of its time debating proposals for the addition of a new agenda item. The Subcommittee reached no conclusions on the substantive topics and could not agree on a choice of a new item, deciding instead to continue consultations at the 42nd UN General Assembly. The United States and seven other Western countries submitted a working paper which offered concrete measures to increase the efficiency of the work of the Subcommittee, in view of the consistent and widely recognized waste of conference resources by the Subcommittee. The East dismissed the paper without making any constructive proposals of their own.

**General Assembly Consideration**

The 42nd General Assembly, on the recommendation of the Special Political Committee, adopted an omnibus resolution dealing with "International Cooperation in the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space" (Resolution 42/68.) Consultations were held on the choice of a new item for the Legal Subcommittee, however, they were inconclusive and the General Assembly decided to defer a final decision to the next session of the Legal Subcommittee in 1988.

The Special Political Committee did not adjourn its consideration of outer space matters before some delegations attempted again to undermine the principle of consensus as the basis of work for questions dealing with the peaceful uses of outer of space. This remains a disturbing annual occurrence which only threatens to undermine the viability of COPUOS. U.S. Alternate Representative Ambassador Hugh Montgomery raised these concerns when he stated that:

> The United States has always operated in the Committee in accordance with the

> consensus procedure agreed upon when COPUOS came into existence. We strongly believe that the continued effectiveness of the Committee depends on whether other members also abide by their commitments. Without continued adherence to consensus there can be no confidence in the ability of the Committee to function in any useful manner.
>
> Some believe that the principle of consensus has become an impediment to substantive progress. We reject this contention and remind these critics that four internationally recognized treaties and, most recently, principles relating to remote sensing of the earth were successfully developed on the basis of consensus. On complex, sensitive , and important technical matters, where the interests of all have to be harmonized, there is no better method of negotiation than that based on consensus. Negotiating on the basis of consensus, however, requires a recognition that consensus embodies not only a commitment to achieve progress in those areas where agreement is possible, but also a commitment to avoid confrontation in those areas where fundamental differences are known to exist.

Despite some relatively useful advances in COPUOS, there are other aspects which have remained intractable. One aspect is the unwillingness by many members to discuss ways of streamlining COPUOS to make it more efficient and effective. Another problem is the continuing tendency by some member states to use COPUOS meetings to introduce disarmament and other extraneous political issues for propaganda reasons (e.g., the Soviet proposal for a World Space Organization). On balance, the West has succeeded only partially in interesting other member states in the process of revitalizing COPUOS and its Subcommittees. In this regard Ambassador Montgomery summarized U.S. views as follows:

> We have been disappointed that certain member states refuse to acknowledge the urgent need for COPUOS and its subsidiary bodies, particularly the Legal Subcommittee, to look at the organization and methods of its work. Those same member states who refuse to confront this reality are also the ones enthusiastically making vague proposals for new international machinery, proposals which are self-promoting rather than conducive to genuine cooperation, and are aimed at diluting the important role played by COPUOS in promoting international collaboration. Equally counterproductive are the proposals for a conference or a special session of the General Assembly to discuss, *inter alia*, the establishment of an international space organization. We would suggest that the considerable resources needed to convene such a conference would be better applied to supporting existing mechanisms for international cooperation, particularly those in the areas of development assistance. We are certainly not interested in discussing ways to duplicate or dismantle the COPUOS structure, but rather, we would prefer to seek methods to strengthen what we have. My delegation only hopes that others share in in this view.

## Law of the Sea

The Third UN Conference on the Law of the Sea (LOS) was convened in 1972 and completed negotiations on an LOS Treaty at its 11th and final session in the spring of 1982.

After a searching review of the draft treaty and of U.S. participation in the LOS negotiations, the administration decided to participate in the final round of negotiations and attempt to protect U.S. interests by seeking amendments to the seabed-mining section of the draft Convention, which the United States believed to be fundamentally flawed. The United States was unable to obtain essential changes and therefore called for a vote on the Treaty. The vote was 130 to 4 (U.S., Turkey, Israel, and Venezuela), with 17 abstentions (principally a combination of European Community (EC) countries and the Eastern European countries). The President subsequently announced on July 19, 1982, that the United States would not sign the Treaty, and it was later joined in this view by two other major seabed-mining nations—the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany.

The General Assembly adopted resolutions at its 37th, 38th, 39th, 40th, and 41st Sessions that welcomed the adoption of the LOS Convention, called on all states to sign and ratify the Convention, and approved financing of the LOS Preparatory Commission from the regular UN budget. Only the United States and Turkey opposed the resolutions. On November 18, 1987, the 42nd General Assembly again endorsed the LOS Convention and approved funds for the Preparatory Committee from the regular UN budget by a vote of 142 to 2 (U.S.), with 6 abstentions. (Resolution 42/2.)

In an explanation of vote, U.S. Alternate Representative Mark Siljander stated in the Assembly plenary on November 18:

> Again my Delegation reluctantly has had to cast a negative vote on a resolution concerning the Law of the Sea. The United States...views the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea as a major accomplishment in the development of international law relating to the oceans. Unfortunately, the convention contains one part, Part XI, that runs contrary to U.S. policy. . . . Therefore, the United States has not signed the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea. Nevertheless, we welcome the resolution of the deep seabed-mining conflicts which affected the commercial interests of U.S. companies and commend the efforts by the respective parties to effect practical solutions to commercial problems...the interests of all states to avoid conflicts over uses of the ocean regardless of their positions with respect to the Law of the Sea Convention.
>
> However, the United States is opposed to this resolution because it continues funding from the general budget of the United Nations for the Preparatory Commission on the international seabed authority and the international tribunal for the Law of the Sea. The costs of the Preparatory Commission should be borne by nations that are party to the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea. . . . Therefore, its costs cannot be assessed against all UN members as part of the UN budget. as they do not represent legitimate "expenses of the organization" within the meaning of Article 17 (2) of the UN Charter. We remain opposed to such improper assessment and are determined to resist such abuses of the UN budget and the UN Charter. Therefore, the United States will continue to withhold its pro rata share of the UN annual assessment from the regular budget that pertains to the funding of the Preparatory Commission or is earmarked to support the implementation of Part XI of the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea.
>
> The U. S. position on the legality of exploration and exploitation of deep seabed resources under international law is well known. As we have stated many times, the United States and its nationals, like other states and their nationals, have the legal right to explore and exploit deep seabed resources. Under international law such activities are a lawful exercise of high seas freedoms. The United States and its nationals intend to exercise these rights with reasonable regard to the interests of other states in their exercise of high seas freedoms.
>
> In addition, this year's resolution once again speaks of the unity of the 1982 Convention on the Law of the Sea and calls upon all states to safeguard the unified character of the convention and related resolutions adopted with it. This cannot be

**understood as a limitation on either the right or duty of all states to act in accordance w
those portions of the convention which reflect customary international law.**

**I wish to emphasize the United States view that the 1982 UN Convention on the L
of the Sea has many positive aspects. The United States will continue to cooperate with
international community to ensure that the important principles enshrined in parts of
convention, other than Part XI, are widely respected.**

## General Political Problems

### MEMBERSHIP

There were no applications for membership in the United Nations
1987.

### QUESTION OF PEACEKEEPING

#### Peacekeeping Committee

In 1965 the General Assembly established the 33 member Speci
Committee on Peacekeeping Operations (Peacekeeping Committee) to ma
recommendations concerning the financial situation.* Since then t
Peacekeeping Committee has been responsible for carrying out
comprehensive review of peacekeeping operations on conceptual a
practical levels.

The Peacekeeping Committee did not meet during 1987.

#### General Assembly

The General Assembly's Special Political Committee considered t
question of peacekeeping in six meetings October 19-20 and November 18-2

On October 20 U.S. Ambassador Hugh Montgomery told the Speci
Political Committee that it would be retrogressive to attempt to reopen t
settled question of guidelines for peacekeeping forces. He added that
would be singularly counterproductive to attempt to turn the clock back a
revive institutions which would report through the Security Council a
would have the effect of bringing the veto power to apply to the day tod
management of peacekeeping.

On November 25 the Special Political Committee adopted a Nigeria
sponsored peacekeeping resolution by consensus. (Resoluti
A/SPC/42/L.30.) The resolution calls on the Peacekeeping Committee

---

*Members in 1987 were: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Cana
Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, German Democratic Republic, Guatema
Hungary, India, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Mauritania, Mexico, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Pola
Romania, Sierra Leone, Spain, Thailand, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela, a
Yugoslavia.

resume its work in 1988, to carry out a comprehensive review of peacekeeping operations with a view to strengthening the UN role in the field. It also requests the Peacekeeping Committee to submit a report to the 43rd General Assembly and includes a provisional agenda item for review by the 43rd General Assembly entitled "Comprehensive Review of the Whole Question of Peace-Keeping Operations in all Their Aspects." On December 8 the General Assembly adopted the resolution without a vote. (Resolution 42/161.)

## EFFORTS TOWARD STRENGTHENING THE UNITED NATIONS

### Charter Committee

The Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Organization (Charter Committee) held its 12th session in New York, February 9-27. The Charter Committee operated through a working group that met in closed meetings and continued to consider the maintenance of international peace and security, the peaceful settlement of disputes, and the rationalization of UN procedures. The primary focus in the context of the maintenance of peace and security was on draft recommendations concerning preventive diplomacy. The Charter Committee reported on its 1987 session to the 42nd General Assembly via the Sixth Committe.

### General Assembly

In six meetings, October 14-21, and in one meeting, November 23, the Sixth Committee considered the report of the Charter Committee.

During the Sixth Committee meetings, the U.S. Representative, Robert Rosenstock, stated that the United States supported work on the France-U.K. working paper on the rationalization of UN procedures and the working paper on the maintenance of peace and security sponsored by Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, and Spain. On the latter paper, the United States considered the existence of 16 substantially agreed paragraphs noteworthy. The United States expressed the belief that significant progress was possible in several areas of the committee's work and pledged a continued positive approach.

On November 23 Egypt introduced a draft resolution (A/C.6/42/L.10), sponsored by 25 states, that was adopted by the Sixth Committee without a vote. On December 7 the General Assembly also adopted the resolution by consensus. The resolution requested the Charter Committee to accord priority during its 1988 session to the question of the maintenance of international peace and security and, in particular, the role of the Security Council. The Committee was requested to complete an appropriate document on the prevention and removal of threats to peace. The resolution requested the committee to continue its work on the question of the peaceful settlement of disputes between states, including further consideration of the proposal for the creation of a permanent commission on good offices, mediation, and conciliation. It requested the Secretary General to continue the preparation of a draft handbook on the peaceful settlement of disputes and urged the committee to keep the question of the rationalization of UN procedures under constant review. (Resolution 42/157.)

On November 23 Romania introduced a draft resolution on the Peaceful Settlement of Disputes Between States (A/C.6/42/L.5), sponsored by 50 states, that was adopted by the Committee by a vote of 100 to 0, with 20 abstentions (U.S.). On December 7 the General Assembly adopted the same resolution by a vote of 136 to 0 with 20 abstentions (U.S.). The United States abstained in both votes because it saw no purpose in a separate resolution since the matter was adequately covered in the Charter resolution which was adopted by consensus. The resolution urges the observance of the Manila Declaration on Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes, urges greater use of the UN framework for the peaceful settlement of disputes, and requests a report from the Secretary-General on the implementation of the Manila Declaration. (Resolution 42/150.)

## QUESTIONS RELATING TO INFORMATION

The Committee on Information (COI), a standing committee of the General Assembly, is mandated to oversee UN public information activities, including those of the Department of Public Information (DPI), and to coordinate information activities of UN specialized agencies. Each year it adopts a set of recommendations on information issues to submit to the Special Political Committee (SPC) of the UN General Assembly, which, after discussion, adopts the recommendations in their original or amended form as a resolution. The COI held its organizational session March 16 and its ninth substantive session June 15-July 2.

In the organizational session, the COI elected a new Bureau, with a Western Chairman, Pablo Barrios (Spain). The Western Group sought unsuccessfully to shorten the substantive session from 3 weeks to 2 as a way of economizing on use of UN resources.

In the substantive session, negotiations to revise the omnibus information resolution (41/68 A) adopted by the General Assembly in 1986 over U.S. objections came to an impasse. In an attempt to break the impasse, COI Chairman Barrios proposed a revised text that considerably improved support for Western principles of freedom of information, free flow of information, and freedom of the press. The revised text enjoyed the full support of the entire Western Group except the United States and, to a lesser extent the United Kingdom. The G-77 and the Eastern European Group had great reservations about the revisions, which they considered too pro-Western. Our Western allies lobbied hard for U.S. support, contending that to adopt the text would erode further the influence of the East Europeans and the radical G-77 countries in the information field. Remaining objectionable elements, our Western allies said, could be nullified in subsequent years.

The United States did not vote for adoption, however, because the text retained support for the establishment of a New World Information and Communication Order (NWICO) and included a number of other formulations we could not accept. Barrios then suggested the set of recommendations be adopted without a vote and referred to the SPC for further discussion. The G-77 and Eastern European Group agreed. The United States was willing to permit the transmittal, but only if a statement were inserted to make clear the maneuver would not be construed as an expression of U.S. approval.

Agreement could not be reached on this compromise formulation. As a result, the G-77, encouraged by the Eastern Europeans, forced Barrios to withdraw his text and then, on the final day of the session, submitted their own. The Committee voted 50 to 1 (U.S.) with 13 abstentions (Western Group) on July 2 to adopt the G-77 text.

The SPC on November 25 adopted the COI's set of recommendations as an omnibus information resolution on general information issues and the DPI by a vote of 109 to 1 (U.S.) with 15 abstentions (most of our NATO allies plus Japan and Israel). The SPC on the same day adopted a draft resolution on UNESCO by a vote of 111 to 1 (U.S.) with 11 abstentions. The General Assembly plenary on December 8 adopted the SPC resolutions: 42/162 A (omnibus information resolution) 136 to 1(U.S.) with 15 abstentions; 42/162 B (UNESCO resolution) 140 to 1 (U.S.) with 11 abstentions. Most remarkable about the large Western abstention on the omnibus resolution was that all but the United Kingdom and Canada had voted for a less favorable resolution in 1986. This tougher Western stance was the result of firm but low-key U.S. lobbying and the efforts of some like-minded Western allies. The large Western abstention demonstrated to the G-77 delegations that information resolutions would have to improve substantially in 1988 to gain broad Western support.

The omnibus information resolution, as passed, underscored more than ever before Western principles of the free flow of information, freedom of information, freedom of the press, and freedom for journalists to carry out their professional work. It also contained a set of program and policy recommendations for the DPI that were more in line than before with Western principles of balance and rational management. The United States felt compelled, however, to oppose the resolution, principally because of objection to the formulation of the provision calling for the establishment of a NWICO. The United States believed the NWICO concept, as formulated, could be cited as justification for creation of a permanent structure or rigid system that would restrict the free flow of information and facilitate government control of the media. The word "order" was believed to connote political and economic systems inherently opposed to freedom of opinion and expression.

In an explanation of vote, the U.S. delegation stated that attempts to control an inherently changing environment by imposing a rigid order cannot work. The United States, the delegation said, is committed to redressing imbalances in information infrastructure by practical means rather than by theoretical or ideological approaches. The resolution was objectionable also because it put excessive emphasis on contentious political issues instead of on the constructive social and humanitarian work of the United Nations, and because it lacked adequate budgetary restraint and fiscal responsibility. U.S. opposition to the resolution on UNESCO arose from its language in support of centralized, statist control of information and from the inclusion of provisions contrary to the goal of UNESCO reform.

The United States has long been critical of the lack of objectivity in the materials the DPI disseminates. In April 1986, the General Accounting Office (GAO), responding to a request by Senator Arlen Specter (R-PA), published a report evaluating DPI printed materials and scripts of its radio programs. The report (GAO/NSIAD-86-98) showed that about half of the products examined opposed key U.S. interests. It recommended that the Secretary of State enhance its review process to improve the monitoring of selected UN public information materials.

The Department of State initiated review procedures in August 1986 at the U.S. Mission to the United Nations in New York and instructed all U.S. Embassies in countries where UN Information Centers are located to review the materials the Centers disseminate. These review procedures have made the DPI more aware of U.S. concerns and more attentive to objectivity and fairness in relation to U.S. interests. The number of occasions the United States is finding it necessary to register concern has been decreasing, and the extent and depth of anti-U.S. bias has diminished somewhat. The appointment of a Canadian director of the DPI in March 1987, along with the reorganization she is implementing and the changes in personnel she has made—including appointment of an American assistant deputy—have produced a greater willingness to listen to and to heed U.S. complaints and suggestions. These developments give cause for optimism that a further reduction in anti-U.S. bias is possible. The monitoring continues.

Part 2

# Economic, Social, Scientific, and Human Rights Affairs

## INTRODUCTION

Chapter III of the UN Charter established the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) as the principal organs of the United Nations responsible for the issues covered in Part 2 of this report. ECOSOC's limited membership (54 countries) has, however, led the developing countries to prefer the General Assembly and its subsidiary bodies where they enjoy maximum voting strength, for substantive discussion and action on international economic issues, especially those directly related to development. As a result, the General Assembly has created entities (described in this part) for substantive discussion and action on international economic issues, especially those directly related to development. The most important of these is the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD).

The General Assembly and its subsidiary bodies constitute the major fora for what has come to be called the North/South dialogue between developed and developing countries. The North/South distinction between developed and developing countries, however, tends to mask the significant differences within each group and to overlook the high degree of economic interdependence which exists between developed and developing countries and among developing countries themselves. In 1987, in concert with Group B (Western industrialized countries), the United States continued efforts to improve the functioning and efficiency of UNCTAD and achieved a successful outcome from the seventh session of UNCTAD.

Another area for North/South dialogue is the UN system review of the Third International Development Strategy - discussed under its own heading in this part. General Assembly resolution 34/138 called for a "round of global and sustained negotiations" on several international economic issues, but there were no significant developments on this front during 1987.

The General Assembly, in its regular sessions, is organized into seven committees. The Second Committee is responsible primarily for economic affairs, and the Third Committee for cultural, humanitarian, and social affairs.

In 1987 constructive efforts in the Second Committee on development issues in such areas as environment and operational activities were achieved despite disagreement and internal division among Second Committee participants resulting in politicized debate on issues such as debt and the Nicaraguan trade embargo.

The debt issue was given highest priority by the Group of 77 (G-77) again this year. However, the G-77 introduced a contentious draft resolution which made negotiations on this issue very difficult. The introduction of a resolution on the Nicaraguan trade embargo resulted in the U.S. withdrawal from the informal negotiations on debt. As a result, the final compromise text did not meet U.S. concerns and the United States was forced to cast the sole negative vote blocking consensus on the resolution.

Following the consensus adoption of two U.S.-sponsored resolutions, including one on entrepreneurship, in last year's session, the United States introduced a resolution on conditions required to promote capital formation in developing countries. This text was designed to continue U.S. efforts to focus Second Committee debate on economic principles and policies which reflect free market values. The introduction of politically charged amendments to the resolution by radical G-77 members, and the politically charged atmosphere of the Second Committee caused by the introduction of the resolution on the Nicaraguan trade embargo, however, forced the United States to withdraw its resolution.

The United States was again faced with a resolution deploring the U.S. trade embargo against Nicaragua. The United States maintained its position that the Second Committee was not the appropriate forum for an issue which was basically political. Despite the U.S. stand, the issue was adopted by a vote of 89 to 3 (U.S.) with 35 abstentions.

The Third Committee considered questions on racism, discrimination, self-determination, aging, crime, the disabled, youth, refugees, women, narcotics, and human rights. A U.S. sponsored resolution on "The Right of Individuals to Own Property" passed despite intense procedural maneuvering by the Soviet delegation. Country-specific human rights resolutions passed on Afghanistan, Chile, El Salvador, and Iran. The United States cosponsored a resolution on religious intolerance and opposed a resolution on "Mercenaries" aimed in part at U.S. support for insurgents in Nicaragua, Afghanistan, and Angola.

The Second and Third Committees receive some of their issues directly, but most are passed to them by ECOSOC. All elements of the UN system primarily concerned with the issues in this section usually report to the General Assembly through ECOSOC. It is authorized only to comment on reports from other bodies before conveying them to the General Assembly.

ECOSOC consists of its plenary body; five regional economic commissions; several functional commissions; and a varying number of subcommissions, working groups, and expert groups. The regional economic commissions and many of the other bodies are covered in this part.

## ECONOMIC AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

### The Critical Economic Situation in Africa

In May of 1986, the General Assembly, at the request of the African Group, convened a special session (the 13th special session of the General Assembly) on "The Critical Economic Situation in Africa" at its headquarters in New York. The special session issued a declaration in which the Africans affirmed their commitment to economic reform and the international community gave a political commitment to support their efforts. The declaration's language on major financial and assistance issues closely paralleled stated U.S. policy. Also significant by its absence from the declaration were references to extraneous political issues, ideological posturing, and rhetorical excesses. The special session also adopted resolution S-13/2 by consensus which contained the UN Program of Action for Economic Recovery and Development 1986-1990 for Africa.

In October 1986 the 41st session of the General Assembly adopted by consensus resolution 41/29 which noted the special session's Program of Action and urged the international community to render whatever assistance possible. The resolution also requested the Secretary General to follow closely the emergency situation in Africa and to report on it at the 42nd session.

As part of the U.S. response to the UN initiative on the critical economic situation in Africa, a Presidential Initiative to End Hunger in Africa was launched in March 1987. Under the initiative, the United States established the Development Fund for Africa (DFA) with an initial appropriation of $500 million. The Fund, which supports the full range of activities traditionally funded under development assistance programs, greatly enhances U.S. ability to promote economic growth and respond quickly and effectively to economic reform efforts in the region.

At the 42nd session of the General Assembly, the United States joined consensus in adopting resolution 42/163, which called for the establishment of an *Ad Hoc* Committee of the Whole of the General Assembly to prepare the review and appraisal of the UN Program of Action prior to the 43rd General Assembly. It further called for the Secretary General to prepare a report including concrete recommendations for full implementation of the UN Program. The U.S. Representative made a statement emphasizing the importance of the commitments of African governments to structural

best copy available

adjustment and domestic policy reform and highlighting the international efforts already underway to help Africa.

## International Development Strategy

The International Development Strategy (IDS) for the 1980's was adopted by consensus in 1980 at the 35th session of the UN General Assembly and was intended to provide a blueprint for international economic growth throughout the decade. Although the IDS endorses many development principles we advocate, it also has significant weaknesses—including overly ambitious and unrealistic growth targets for developing countries in the 1980's, and excessive dependence on official development assistance (ODA) for meeting its goals by calling for donor countries to reach an assistance target of 0.7 percent of GNP. Because of these weaknesses, the United States made a statement of reservation at the time of the adoption of the IDS.

A 1985 system-wide mid-term review of the Third IDS contained the first acknowledgement within the United Nations of an improvement in the world economy, and called for the Secretariat to study the implications of different development policies— which we can use to advance policies which have been successful, i.e., reliance on market principles and the private sector.

IDS now appears regularly on the agenda of UN bodies and resolutions on economic and social development frequently refer to it. A resolution adopted at the 42nd General Assembly requested the Secretary General to compile information which can be used in 1988 to reassess the 3rd IDS and also to begin preparation for a new IDS for the 1990s.

## Long-Term Trends in Economic Development

The General Assembly first showed an interest in long-term trends and forecasts at its 30th session in 1975. Stating that an examination of long-term trends in the economic development of individual regions was of great importance for securing a rapid rate of economic development of all countries, in particular of developing countries, the General Assembly requested the Secretary General to prepare a comprehensive report on long-term trends and forecasts in the economic development of the various regions and their mutual relationship. At its 32nd session, the General Assembly requested the Secretary General to prepare an overall socio-economic perspective of the development of the world economy up to the year 2000. This report was 5 years in preparation and when it appeared in 1982, the United States found it to be unduly pessimistic, biased toward blaming international factors rather than domestic policies for the economic problems of developing countries, while paying insufficient attention to the role of the private sector in development. Nevertheless, the General Assembly requested the Secretary General to prepare another comprehensive report for submission in 1985 and wanted to institutionalize the preparation of revised and updated reports ery 3 years. The United States opposed this idea, largely because we feel t such reports are better handled by the IMF and the World Bank which ssess greater economic expertise than the UN Secretariat.

At its 40th session in 1985 the General Assembly took note of the retary General's latest report on the overall socio-economic perspective of world economy to the year 2000, and charged him with revising and dating it in time for the 42nd session in 1987. The United States opposed resolution because it contained unacceptable references to the New ernational Economic Order and to the relationship between disarmament d development. The vote was 144 to 1 (U.S.) with 13 abstentions. solution 40/207.)

Review of the Secretary General's report was subsequently postponed il the 43rd session of the General Assembly in 1988.

## onomic Commission for Europe

The Economic Commission for Europe (ECE), established in 1947, is one ive regional economic commissions which report to ECOSOC. It has 34 mbers - the European members plus Canada, Switzerland, and the United es. Other UN member countries take part, in a consultative capacity, when tters of particular concern to them are considered. Composed largely of eloped nations, ECE focuses on problems confronting modern ustrialized societies. Decisions are made by consensus reached in berations between Eastern and Western caucuses.

ECE's terms of reference are broad and over the years the nature of its k has paralleled changing European and Atlantic concerns. When first blished, the ECE's principal focus was on European postwar economic onstruction. Since then the Commission has evolved into a forum where t and West can consult on economic and technical problems of common erest. The Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in ope (CSCE) specifically accorded the ECE a number of responsibilities for ltilateral activity in economics, transportation, science, technology, and the ironment.

The concluding document of the follow-up meeting of representatives of participating states of the CSCE signed in Madrid in 1983 reaffirmed the E's role as a forum for implementing provisions relating to energy, trade, air ution, and transport.

ECE carries out its activities principally through 15 specialized mittees—Agricultural Problems; Chemical Industry; Coal; Electric Power; ; Housing, Building and Planning; Inland Transport; Steel; Timber; elopment of Trade; Conference of European Statisticians; Senior Advisors Environmental and Water Problems; Senior Advisors on Science and

Technology; Senior Economic Advisors; and a number of subsidiary bodies which deal with special problems included in the committees' programs. Additional subjects of interest to the Commission are dealt with by *Ad Hoc* groups, notably the Senior Advisors on Energy, the Group of Experts on Standardization Policies, and the Working Party on Engineering Industries and Automation. From time to time, and often in conjunction with other mutilateral organizations such as the FAO and ILO, ECE convenes special symposia, seminars, and conferences. Study tours to member countries are occasionally arranged in connection with such meetings. A substantial number of U.S. Government departments and agencies, as well as congressional and private sector representatives, actively participate in ECE-sponsored meetings.

The Commission held its 42nd session March 31-April 10, in Geneva. The meeting was held against a backdrop of the ongoing CSCE review in Vienna, the celebration of the Commission's 40th anniversary, and an improved overall East-West relationship. In resolutions of key importance to the United States, language reflecting Western views predominated. By approving a meeting of the Senior Advisors on Energy (an Eastern initiative), the West was able to gain strong leverage during the rest of the session. Increased administrative support for the UN Committee on the Transport of Dangerous Goods was endorsed and all key Western objectives in the restructuring exercise were met.

## Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific

The Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) was established in 1947. The United States was one of the 10 original members. Presently there are 38 members and 9 associate members. Five members (France, Netherlands, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States) are from outside the region, which covers an extensive area from Mongolia south to New Zealand, and from Iran east to the island nations in the Pacific. ESCAP's headquarters are in Bangkok, although some subsidiary bodies and other activities are located in other Asian cities. ESCAP's primary role is to serve member countries by indentifying problems in the area of social and economic development, providing a forum for debate on development issues, providing technical assistance and advisory services, and helping members attract outside assistance. It does not itself provide capital resources, but helps establish institutions to attract funds for regional and subregional projects which, in turn, supply development assistance.

The annual Commission sessions provide the main guidance for ESCAP's program and activities, while the Secretariat prepares reports and compiles statistics on current economic issues in the region for distribution to member governments. It also prepares and services the meetings of the Commission and the following nine substantive committees: Agricultural Development; Development Planning; Industry, Human Settlements and Technology;

latural Resources; Population; Social Development; Statistics; Trade; and hipping, Transport and Communications. The present work program and ctivities are concentrated in six priority areas: food and agriculture; energy; aw materials and commodities; transfer of technology; international trade; nd integrated rural development.

ESCAP is primarily funded by the UN regular budget. In addition, SCAP receives funding from other UN agencies, especially UNDP, to which ne United States is a major contributor. Finally, the United States has from me to time participated in individual ESCAP programs of special interest by roviding extra-budgetary contributions.

The 43rd Commission Session was held in Bangkok from April 21-30. It dopted 5 resolutions including a 40th Anniversary Declaration of the ommission. Other resolutions adopted included a resolution on Human esources Development which called for the convening of a group of experts o formulate guidelines for an ESCAP integrated plan of action, and a esolution on reform of the UN system in the economic and social fields, which educed ESCAP's nine legislative committees to seven that meet once every 2 ears.

Much of the 43rd session's work was characterized by criticism from eveloping countries about national and international economic issues such as rotectionism, commodity prices, and declining economic assistance and imulation of industrial growth. The U.S. Delegation continued to press for n open trading system, market-oriented development strategies, the nportant role of the private sector, and the need for better use of UN system esources. Political rhetoric was relatively mild by ECOSOC standards, though the Soviet delegation and its allies attempted repeatedly to introduce nguage about disarmament, peace, and international economic security.

The expert group meeting to develop an integrated plan of action on uman Resources Development called for by the 43rd Commission was held Tokyo, December 7-10. The results of the meeting will be discussed at the th session of ESCAP in April 1988.

## conomic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean

The Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean CLAC) was established in 1948 as a regional organization to promote the onomic development of Latin America and to strengthen economic ties nong Latin American countries and between them and the rest of the world. this end, ECLAC produces studies of various sectors and issues within the atin American economy, analyzes economic and social conditions in the gion, reviews the progress of development plans and programs, and ovides training and technical assistance. ECLAC has 35 Western emisphere members (including the United States and Canada) 4 nonregional members (France, United Kingdom, Netherlands, and Portugal) and 4 associate members (British Virgin Islands, U.S. Virgin Islands, Netherlands Antilles, and Montserrat). ECLAC has its headquarters in Santiago, Chile, and has branch offices in Washington, D.C., and in six Latin American countries.

ECLAC's primary role is to serve member countries by identifying problems in the region in the area of economic development. ECLAC produces studies of various sectors and issues within the Latin American economy, analyzes economic and social conditions in the region, reviews the progress of development plans and programs, and provides training and technical assistance. The biannual Commission sessions provide guidance for ECLAC's programs and activities.

ECLAC is funded by the UN regular budget. In addition, ECLAC receives funding from other UN agencies, especially UNDP and UNFPA, as well as from bilateral sources.

ECLAC's general sessions or plenaries are held in even years usually in a different Latin American capital each time. The 21st ECLAC plenary, which met in Mexico City April 17-25, 1986, adopted a resolution to hold an extraordinary session of ECLAC in Mexico City in January 1987, to consider debt and other regional economic issues (the United States alone abstained).

The Special Conference of ECLAC was held in Mexico City, January 19-23. The Latin American debt crisis dominated the proceedings of the Conference. The ECLAC Latin American and Caribbean Group, CEGAN (ECLAC members excluding the United States and other industrialized countries), circulated an extremely unbalanced and alarmist declaration that advanced the Latin view that external factors were the cause of the region's economic difficulties. The United States opposed this document and stressed the need for appropriate structural adjustment policies, including support for the private sector. A compromise was reached whereby the CEGAN declaration, more moderate ECLAC Secretariat documents, and a statement of U.S. views were given equal weight in the final document of the conference. The Conference did not adopt any resolution.

The ECLAC Committee of the Whole, which meets in the intervening years between Commission plenary sessions, was held in New York, August 13-14. The Committee met to review work of the Commission since its last plenary session and to prepare for the 22nd session to be held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in April 1988. The U.S. Delegation was successful in introducing private sector issues into the work program for the following biennium.

## Economic Commission for Africa

The Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) was established in 1958 as a gional organization to promote economic development in Africa. Full embership is limited to independent African countries of which 51 are rrently members. The United States, while not a member, supports the mmission's activities by maintaining liaison with ECA headquarters in ldis Ababa, Ethiopia, attending some of its meetings as an observer, and oviding financial and technical assistance through the U.S. Agency for ernational Development (AID).

The ECA is charged with promoting the economic and social velopment of Africa; strengthening economic relations among African intries and territories; undertaking studies on economic development; llecting, evaluating, and disseminating economic and technical information; d helping to formulate policies to promote economic development. ECA o provides advisory services to its members in various economic and social lds.

The ECA is funded primarily by the UN regular budget. In addition, the A receives funding from other UN agencies and bilateral donors. The U.S. ency for International Development concluded a technical assistance reement with the ECA in 1983 to provide $710,000 during 1983-1987 to be ed for the support of two projects which will: (a) strengthen human ources planning and development management training at the Institute for onomic Development and Planning in Dakar, Senegal, and (b) improve the nmunications capability of ECA's African Training and Research Center for men.

The 22nd session of the Commission and the ECA's 13th Ministerial eting were held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 13-27. The Commission epared its program of work for the biennium 1988-1989 and adopted 34 olutions relating to, *inter alia*, the following topics: mobilization of domestic ancial resources for economic and social development; women and velopment; industrial development in Africa; the Substantial New Program Action in African least developed countries; and the UN Transport and mmunications Decade in Africa.

## onomic and Social Commission for Western Asia

The Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA) was ablished in 1974. Currently, there are 14 members including the PLO. hough a UN member of the region involved, Israel was effectively excluded m membership because of the original wording of the 1973 ECOSOC olution establishing the Commission. The United States objected at the ne, considering that the language was contrary to the terms of the UN arter. The Commission's headquarters were moved from Beirut to Baghdad 1981 because of war damage in Beirut. The name of the Commission was nged in 1986 from the Economic Commission for Western Asia (ECWA) to current name to reflect the Commission's greater emphasis on social issues.

ESCWA is funded by the UN regular budget.

The 14th session of ESCWA was held March 31-April 5 in Baghdad. In addition to ESCWA members, several countries attended the meeting as observers, including the United States.

Discussions in the 14th session were characterized by concern over falling oil prices and revenues and their impact on development and the conditions of migrant labor. The Commission approved a work program for 1988-1989 which includes, *inter alia*, the following program areas: food and agriculture; development issues and policies; human settlements; international trade and development finance; natural resources; industrial development; population; social development; transport and communications; transnational corporations; and management of technical cooperation activities.

## United Nations Development Program (UNDP)

The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) is a voluntary fund which finances the world's largest multilateral program of grant technical assistance (advisory services, fellowships, demonstration and training equipment). UNDP was established in 1966 through the merger of two earlier UN programs, the Special Fund and the Expanded Program of Technical Assistance. The General Assembly established UNDP to be the principal UN mechanism for financing technical assistance activities. UNDP provides grant technical assistance to developing countries and territories at their request, with increasing emphasis on assistance to the poorest countries. In 1987 UNDP projects were underway in some 150 countries and territories.

UNDP's programs consist of projects lasting from a few months to several years in agriculture (land and water utilization, food processing), industry (product development, pilot plants), education (teacher training, literacy programs), health (maternal and child health care services, medical training), economic policy and planning (institutes for economic planning, national statistical services), transportation (water and air transportation, rural transportation), and natural resource exploration (mining techniques, mineral exploration techniques).

UNDP also undertakes smaller projects such as fellowships for the training of nationals of developing countries and provides such countries with needed skills through the use of expert advisers.

In addition, UNDP undertakes preinvestment and feasibility studies to promote developing country and external investor interest in capital projects aimed at expanding production and employment. Projects are normally executed for UNDP by one of the 29 participating agencies of the UN system, such as FAO, the UN Department of Technical Cooperation for Development (DTCD), UNIDO, ILO, UNESCO, World Bank, or ICAO. UNDP also directly undertakes a small number of projects through its own Office for Projects Services.

UNDP is headquartered in New York. Its Administrator, William H. Draper III, of the United States, assumed office in May 1986. His term expires December 31, 1989.

## GOVERNING AND ADVISORY BODIES

UNDP is a subsidiary organ of the UN General Assembly, which sets overall UNDP policy. UNDP's operating policies are established and its programs and budgets approved by a Governing Council composed of representatives of 48 states—21 developed and 27 developing.* The Governing Council reports to the General Assembly through ECOSOC, which elects states to the Council for 3-year terms. The United States plays a leading role in UNDP affairs and has been a member of the Governing Council since its establishment. The Council holds regular sessions each year in June. There is a brief organizational meeting in February.

The UNDP Governing Council provided oversight for the following bodies in 1987: UN Capital Development Fund, UN Volunteers, UN Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration, UN Sudano-Sahelian Office, UN Fund for Science and Technology for Development, U.N. Trust Fund for Colonial Countries and Peoples, Energy Account, UN Special Fund for Landlocked Developing Countries, UN Development Fund for Women,Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries, and the Inter-Agency Procurement Services Unit. The Council also provides policy guidance for the small program of technical assistance financed from the regular UN budget, and is the governing body for the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA.)

## SECRETARIAT AND FIELD ORGANIZATION

UNDP's administrative apparatus consists of a secretariat in New York and 112 offices in developing countries and territories where programs are being carried out. Assisted by their staffs, UNDP Resident Representatives advise recipient governments on development planning and UN assistance. Within their countries of assignment, they coordinate UNDP programs and, where appropriate, those of the UN Capital Development Fund, UN Volunteers, the UN Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration, and UNFPA. Resident Representatives also act for and support other UN agencies including the World Food Program, the UN Environment Program, the Office of the UN Disaster Relief Coordinator, the UN Department of Technical Cooperation for Development, and the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees.

---

*The following states were members of the UNDP Governing Council in 1987: Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, People's Rep. of, Colombia, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, Fiji, France, Germany, Dem. Rep. of, Germany, Fed. Rep. of, India, Indonesia, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kuwait, Korea, Rep. of, Liberia, Malawi, Mauritius, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States.

In most countries, the UN Secretary General has designated the UNDP Resident Representative as Resident Coordinator of the United Nations Operational Activities for Development. As such, he/she is responsible for overseeing all UN agency development activities in the country to which he/she is accredited. Questions continue about the effectiveness of the Resident Coordinator in this role, and the Director General for Development and International Economic Cooperation, undertook a review of eight case studies of UN field operations which the UNDP Governing Council will consider at the 1988 Council.

## PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

### Patterns of Development Assistance

UNDP development assistance is allocated to countries and intercountry activities based on anticipated development assistance allocations called Indicative Planning Figures (IPFs), which cover 5-year planning cycles. The First Planning Cycle extended from 1972 through 1976, the Second Cycle was from 1977 through 1981, the Third Cycle was from 1982 through 1986, and the Fourth Cycle began in 1987 and will run through 1991. IPFs in the First Cycle were set largely on the basis of the aid that UNDP supplied from 1967 through 1971. That is, countries had a claim upon UNDP resources during that cycle equal to the percentage of UNDP assistance they actually received in the earlier 5-year period. IPF figures for the Second Planning Cycle were primarily based on country populations and per capita GNPs. In allocating the IPFs for the Third Cycle, the Governing Council gave highest priority to countries with the lowest per capita GNPs or which were otherwise disadvantaged (Decision 80/30, adopted without a vote June 26, 1980). For the Fourth Cycle, about 64 percent of country program resources will be allocated to countries with a per capita GNP of $375 or less, and the concept of graduation requires that recipient countries with per capita income of $3,000 or more attain net contributor status.

### Activities and Analysis

The organizational meeting and special session of the 34th session met in February 1987 in New York. Debate in the organizational meeting centered on progress made in rationalizing the work of the Governing Council, including the issue of biennialization of reports and consideration of annual reports on a 2-year experimental basis. It was decided that reports of the special funds administered by UNDP (except for the UN Fund for Women) would be submitted on a biennial basis. The United States and other delegations did not concur in biennialization of the annual regional implementation reports, which the UNDP Administration agreed to continue on a yearly basis.

The special session met immediately following the organizational meeting and heard Administrator William H. Draper, III (U.S.) announce establishment of a new action committee of senior staff to coordinate program policies and to review and approve all projects valued at more than $400,000. This measure was taken as part of Administrator Draper's effort to improve UNDP's program formulation. The Governing Council also authorized the use of $500,000 from special program resources funds for the Project Development Facility, a mechanism to increase technical expertise available for project design, which the United States has supported since its inception and believes could be a vital tool in enhancing the quality and delivery of UNDP programs and projects. The Council reviewed and approved 28 country programs; most of them from the Latin American and Caribbean region. In the debate on the Administrator's document describing trends and problems in country programs, the United States requested more analysis to accompany the array of aggregated statistics.

The Governing Council held its 34th session in June in New York. The Council reached consensus on continuation of the Committee of the Whole with an expanded mandate (to include UNFPA and possibly UNDP regional projects) and continuation of the Working Group on an experimental basis until June 1989. The United States and other major donors strongly supported continuation of the Committee of the Whole and its Working Group and expressed the view that these bodies have helped strengthen the Council's role in overseeing UNDP's operations and management as well as dealing with policy and programming matters. A number of developing countries, especially the higher income Latin countries questioned the usefulness of the Working Group. Switzerland announced its willingness to cover the cost of participants from least developed countries to assure Working Group discussions kept a practical focus on issues affecting actual program implementation in the field.

The Council approved 44 country programs. Among the reviews which the Council asked the Administrator to undertake were: an in-depth look at UN Volunteers, UNDP's use of the support cost line in the budget, the performance of the UN Development Fund for Women, and problems and costs associated with agency backstopping of UNDP-funded, government-executed projects.

The most vigorously debated issue during the session was the Governing Council's submission to the ECOSOC special commission on U.N. reform. The drafting of the text to be submitted to ECOSOC revealed a divergence of views between developing nations on the one hand, and the United States and its western allies on the other, regarding aspects of the UN system's operational activities for development and the need for improvements in the performance of UNDP's Governing Council and its subsidiary bodies such as the

Committee of the Whole and Working Group. There was no consensus on the proposal before the Special Commission of a single governing body for operational activities. Most delegations felt that such an idea had serious drawbacks, while others thought it premature to express their views. A final text, taking into account the divergent views of the two sides, was submitted to the ECOSOC.

The Governing Council also:

— called on the Administrator to take appropriate measures to ensure improved performance by agencies executing UNDP-funded projects,

— approved a 1988-89 biennial budget of $394 million (gross),

— endorsed the Administrator's proposal to collaborate with the World Health Organization and other agencies in the effort to fight AIDS,

— requested UNDP to assist interested African governments, at their request, in strengthening their capacities to formulate and implement economic reforms and structural adjustment programs, and

— requested the Administrator to submit a report on how women in development perspectives are reflected in the content of the work of UNDP.

The Working Group of the Committee of the Whole met three times during the year: February 10-13, April 13-14, and September 14-16. The United States took the lead in developing the agenda which the Council ultimately approved, including:

— effectiveness of coordination at the field level,

— the need to increase procurement of services and equipment by UNDP from developing countries,

— analysis of the cost, quality, and impact of project personnel,

— action plan for implementation of measures to improve program and project quality,
— holding the executing agencies responsible for implementation of UNDP-funded projects,

— experience of UNFPA relating to allocation and expenditure in projects implemented by the various Specialized Agencies, and

— the role of UNDP field offices in program and project activities.

Discussions in the Working Group are informal and no official records of the meetings are kept. Discussions during 1987 provided members with a close look at the structure and workload of field offices, and the relationships of the resident representative with other UN system organizations and bilateral aid agencies at the field level. They also highlighted the continuing problem of the UNDP's apparently limited ability to hold agencies implementing UNDP projects accountable for effective performance. The UNDP indicated the difficulties in finding mechanisms to assure effective program implementation. The donors, led by Canada and the United States, requested the Secretariat to develop proposals for improvements to be considered at subsequent Working Group and Governing Council sessions.

The United States voluntarily contributed $107.5 million to UNDP in 1987, down from $138.115 million in 1986. Our contribution represented 12.42 percent of resources pledged to UNDP for 1987.

## United Nations Volunteers

The UN Volunteers (UNV) program, established by the General Assembly at its 25th session, began operation in January 1971. The program provides educated and skilled volunteers to developing countries to assist them in development activities. Volunteers are recruited on as wide a geographical basis as possible, including, in particular, the developing countries. The Volunteers are specialists at the level (middle-level and operational) for which they volunteer and are assigned.

The General Assembly designated the Administrator of the UN Development Program (UNDP) as the Administrator of the UNV. A Coordinator based in Geneva promotes and coordinates the recruitment, selection, and administrative management of the activities of the Volunteers within the UN system. This arrangement permits dovetailing of UNDP's technical assistance activities with the expertise available through the Volunteer program. Many Volunteers are assigned to UNDP field offices, to the projects funded by UNDP or the specialized agencies of the United Nations.

UNDP resources as well as financing from the Special Voluntary Fund, and other resources support the activities of the Volunteers. Expenditures for 1987 amounted to $19.8 million. This consisted of: $12.2 million allocated to the projects directly executed by UNV and the external costs of all volunteers from developing countries; and $7.6 million for financing UNVs assigned to projects executed by other UN agencies.

The U.S. Peace Corps works closely with UNV to recruit and sponsor American volunteers. The Peace Corps also provides their external expenses. In 1987, the United States, through the Peace Corps budget, pledged $75,000 to the Special Voluntary Fund. This sum represents 6.6 percent of total pledges amounting to $1,131,656. Leading contributors to the Fund in 1987 were Italy ($287,770), Belgium ($238,095), Switzerland ($160,714), the Federal Republic of

Germany ($150,000), Norway ($132,450), and Denmark ($86,667). However, among industrialized sending countries, the United States, with 38 Volunteers, has more of its nationals assigned to UNV than any other country.

The number of Volunteers in service reached 1,269 in 1987, of which 1,097 (86 percent) are from developing countries. They are currently serving in 92 countries on every continent. Volunteers are assigned to many sectors of development, primarily agriculture, health, and education.

The concerns of industrialized countries about the focus and procedures in recruitment of Volunteers, programming for their use, new financing proposals, and the continued low percentage of Volunteers recruited from Western industrialized countries (which together provide the preponderance of resources for UNDP and UNV) stimulated a lively debate at the 34th session of the UNDP Governing Council.

The United States, in a formal statement, urged that the role and cost-effectiveness of Volunteers be considered when field projects are being drawn up. Noting the increasing recognition of the valuable contributions of Volunteers and their commendable record during the emergency in Africa, the U.S. spokesman pointed to the need for decisions on size and composition of the program, on financing, training, and oversight. The United States, joined by others, called for an independent evaluation of UNVs and suggested that new financing mechanisms be linked to the program structure.

The Council, reiterating its support for UNV, requested the Administrator of UNDP to undertake a review of the program, bearing in mind the debate just concluded and consonant with the terms of reference elaborated by the Council. This review of the UN Volunteer Program was conducted during mid-1987 and completed in late fall. The results and recommendations will be considered by the Council at its 35th session in June 1988.

## UN Capital Development Fund

The UN Capital Development Fund (UNCDF) is a trust fund that UNDP administers. UNCDF provides modest grants to small-scale endeavors that use small-scale, low-cost/low-maintenance technology to create or upgrade agricultural and industrial infrastructure and facilities. The General Assembly, in 1966, established UNCDF which in the years since has directed 90 percent of its assistance to 36 least developed countries.

UNCDF seeks to improve local production and expand indigenous employment skills, and productive capacity. This, in turn, reduces reliance on outside assistance and promotes private initiative. Since the projects are relatively small and apply small-scale technology, they provide the participants with a sense of identification, motivation, and early results. In addition, UNCDF seeks the widest participation by the beneficiary group and the maximum use of local resources. Fund projects have included irrigation and food storage facilities, rural school health centers, cottage industries, cooperative credit unions, and vocational training facilities.

The UNDP Administrator is the Fund's Managing Director and the UNDP Governing Council provides policy guidance to UNCDF. UNCDF has a small administrative staff in New York headed by an Executive Secretary. It relies on UNDP for proposing and monitoring field projects. However, in countries where CDF has a large program, it assigns a Junior Professional Officer (JPO), seconded from various donor countries, to monitor CDF projects at the field level.

At the 34th Governing Council in June 1987, the Administrator reported that during 1986 UNCDF approved $46.3 million in commitments in field activity, including 24 new projects and 27 grant increases. Projects in agriculture and irrigation accounted for more than one-third of total cumulative commitments. The Council also approved modification of the partial funding system in order to expand further the volume of UNCDF assistance and to reduce the liquidity that has been building in UNCDF's balance sheet.

The United States first contributed to UNCDF in 1978. The $861,000 U.S. contribution in 1987 represented 2.67 percent of total UNCDF contributions. Sweden ($6.2 million) offered the largest contribution, followed by the Netherlands ($6.1 million) and Norway ($4.0 million). The trend in contributions to UNCDF has been rising due to real increases in contributions by donors and to the U.S. dollar exchange rate. Contributions in 1987 reached $32.1 million, which is an 18.9 percent increase over those of 1986.

## UN Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)

### INTRODUCTION

The United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) was created in 1967, as an autonomous organization within the UN Secretariat, to accelerate and promote the process of industrialization in developing countries. On January 1, 1986, UNIDO was converted into an independent specialized agency of the UN system, culminating an effort begun in 1975. Membership in UNIDO is open to all members of the United Nations, its specialized agencies, and the IAEA. At the end of 1987, there were 148 member states. The United States has participated in UNIDO since its inception.

UNIDO, headquartered in Vienna, has three principal organs: the General Conference (GC), the Industrial Development Board (IDB), and the Program and Budget Committee (PBC). The Secretariat is the implementing organ of UNIDO. The IDB and PBC meet annually and the GC meets biennially. PBC recommendations are passed to the IDB for consideration and all IDB decisions go forward to the GC for consideration. The GC, IDB and PBC all require a two-thirds majority to adopt decisions on budgetary matters.

## UNIDO MEETINGS

The United States sent delegations to the three major meetings held by UNIDO in 1987: the General Conference held in Bangkok, November 9-13, in which over 120 of the 148 member states participated; the 53-member Industrial Development Board (IDB)* held in Vienna, June 30-July 3; and the 27-member Program and Budget Committee (PBC)** held in Vienna, March 9-18.

The Program and Budget Committee decisions were forwarded to the Industrial Development Board for consideration, and in turn, to the General Conference for final decision.

The U.S. Delegation to the General Conference of UNIDO, the second since its conversion to a specialized agency, was headed by Bruce Chapman,U.S. Ambassador to the UN agencies in Vienna. In the U.S. statement to the plenary on November 11, Ambassador Chapman reaffirmed U.S. support for the new orientation of UNIDO, including its increased cooperation with the private sector, progress made in improving the System of Consultations Division, and its cooperation with other UN agencies. He cited, as examples of heightened cooperation, recent UNIDO collaboration with the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) on the Fisheries Consultation and with the International Labor Organization (ILO) on the Industrial Manpower Training Consultation.

## ACTIVITIES IN 1987

### Program and Budget Planning Process

The GC approved a decision which called for the Director General toprepare, in the first year of each fiscal period, a draft plan including regular and operational budget activities. This would include a statement of the relative priorities of the programs and sub-programs and a general ceiling for the following biennium. This decision, promoted by the United States, was an outgrowth of General Assembly resolution 41/213 relating to UN reform.

---

*Members of the IDB: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Chile, China, Cote d'Ivoire, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Federal Republic of Germany, France, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Nigeria, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tanzania, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukrainian S.S.R., U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

**Members of the PBC in 1987: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bangladesh, Brazil, China, Cote d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Federal Republic of Germany, Finland, France, Hungary, India, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Morocco, Netherlands, Nigeria, Peru, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, and Zimbabwe.

The GC established a working group to prepare a draft 1990–1995 Medium Term Plan to present to the Director General and ultimately to PBC members prior to the June 1988 PBC Meeting.

### 1986-1987 Budget Supplemental Request

The PBC did not approve the Director General's request for a $3.1 million supplemental appropriation for 1986-1987 to cover increased costs and exchange rate losses. However, the request was subsequently approved by the IDB and by the GC plenary, by a vote of 89 in favor, 12 (U.S.) opposed, and 5 abstaining. The U.S. delegation said it could not support the request for higher assessments in view of the inability of the United States to meet assessments at current levels. Billings for the supplemental appropriation were to be included in the 1988 assessments against members.

### Program Budget for 1988-1989

The General Conference adopted two decisions by consensus : The first established a split-currency system of assessment for the 1988-1989 biennium, based on Austrian Schilling/U.S. dollar expenditures of 71.8 and 28.2 percent respectively; the second approved a budget level of $154,283,442 for the 1988-1989 biennium. In terms of the U.S. assessment, this represents an increase from $14.8 million in 1987 to approximately $20 million in 1988.

### Arrearages in U.S. Assessed Contributions

At the end of 1987, the United States owed $18,435,702 towards the 1986-1987 regular assessment of $30.4 million. The shortfall in U.S. payments resulted in questions being raised in the UNIDO governing bodies concerning the seriousness of U.S. interest in orienting UNIDO toward private sector development and of U.S. declarations of support for the Director General's efforts to reorient UNIDO along those lines.

### Political Issues

The United States called for a vote and voted no on proposed decisions that UNIDO provide technical assistance to Palestinian, Namibian, and South African peoples in cooperation with the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), the South West Africa Peoples' Organization (SWAPO), and the African National Congress (ANC) and Pan African Congress (PAC), respectively. All three decisions were approved with large majorities.

**Miscellaneous Decisions**

The United States joined the consensus on decisions on the financial regulations (with the exception of those relating to changes in the tax equalization fund), the industrial development fund, the working capital fund, and appointment of the external auditor. Routine personnel matters were adopted with minor changes to the decisions on the joint staff pension fund and staff regulations.

The General Conference admitted to membership Namibia, Tonga, and Vanuatu as members of UNIDO and agreed that the third session would be held November 20-24, 1989, in Vienna.

## INVESTMENT PROMOTION SERVICE

The UNIDO-sponsored Washington Investment Promotion Service office (IPS) was established to attract joint venture partners and investment capital to developing countries. There are nine such offices* throughout the world. UNIDO Director General Domingo Siazon conducted a press conference and hosted a reception in May for the official opening of the IPS office in Washington after its move from New York. Its program of work emphasizes increased and direct cooperation with the U.S. private sector at the level of industry associations, state and regional development associations, chambers of commerce, and individual firms. In 1987 the United States contributed $150,000 to the IPS office through the Department of State.

The IPS incorporated a new foundation in the United States in March with a mandate to raise private-sector, tax-exempt contributions to finance industrial development efforts relating to UNIDO's mandate. An application to the Internal Revenue Service was to be prepared to obtain tax-exempt status.

The Washington IPS was represented at the Investors Forum in Bangladesh and recruited American joint venture partners to attend meetings in Egypt, Thailand, and Indonesia.

## SYSTEM OF CONSULTATIONS

The UNIDO System of Consultations is an action-oriented forum designed to accelerate the industrialization of developing countries by encouraging the involvement of governments and industry. In 1987 the United States participated in three successful sector-specific consultations organized by UNIDO: fisheries, hosted by the Polish Government; training of industrial manpower, hosted by the French Government; and pharmaceuticals, hosted by the Spanish Government. All three consultations were widely attended and facilitated contacts between industrialized and developing countries.

---

*IPS Offices: Cologne, Milan, Paris, Seoul, Tokyo, Vienna, Warsaw, Washington, and Zurich.

## General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT)

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) is not part of the UN system, although it was created at a UN-sponsored conference and GATT cooperates with UN organizations, where appropriate. For example, the GATT Contracting Parties and UNCTAD jointly operate an International Trade Center to assist developing countries in promoting their exports.

The General Agreement is an international agreement which entered into force in January 1948. The United States has been a party to GATT since its inception. In 1986, 94 countries, accounting for more than four-fifths of world trade, were members. An additional 30 countries maintain a *de facto* "application" of the GATT and one country, Tunisia, has acceded provisionally.

GATT is the principal multilateral instrument through which the United States seeks to improve the world trading system. It is both a code of rules and a forum in which negotiations and other trade discussions take place. GATT is intended to play a major role in the settlement of trade disagreements between member countries.

The most recent of the eight multilateral rounds of trade negotiations under GATT auspices was launched in September 1986 at Punta del Este, Uruguay. The new round, known as the Uruguay Round, is the most comprehensive round of multilateral trade negotiations ever attempted. The Uruguay Round is a key element in the U.S. effort to open markets and fight protectionism.

The previous round of trade negotiations, known as the Tokyo Round, was completed in 1979. In addition to tariff reductions, the Tokyo Round produced, for the first time, an agreement on rules of conduct in nontariff areas; codes on subsidies and countervailing duties; on technical barriers to trade (standards); on import licensing procedures; on antidumping; and on trade in bovine meat, dairy products, and civil aircraft. All went into effect in January 1980. The codes covering government procurement and customs valuation went into effect at the beginning of 1981. The work program adopted in November 1979 gave first priority to implementing the Tokyo Round results, and committees have been established to administer each of the code agreements.

Although the Tokyo Round of trade negotiations contributed significantly to trade liberalization, it soon became evident that another round of trade negotiations was needed to come to grips with remaining impediments to trade, especially to trade in services. The depressed worldwide trade and economic situation created a climate in which the United

States felt it was particularly important to address the emerging issues of the 1980's as well as to advance unfinished programs.

In November 1982 the Contracting Parties met at the Ministerial level for the first time in nearly 10 years. Work took place throughout 1983 and continued through 1986, culminating in the ministerial agreement launching the Uruguay Round (GATT document MIN/DEC 20 September 1986). The Round has launched the first multilateral negotiations on services and has incorporated them with negotiations on goods as a part of a single trade negotiation. Ministers agreed to establish a Trade Negotiations Committee to manage the overall negotiations and two negotiating groups to carry out the negotiations: a Group on Negotiations on Goods to negotiate traditional GATT issues, including investment and intellectual property, and a Group on Negotiations on Services to deal with services matters.

After the Punta del Este Ministerial, the focus of the Uruguay Round negotiations shifted to the GATT seat in Geneva. The United States has taken a strong leadership role in the negotiations, is generally satisfied with the progress achieved in the Uruguay Round in 1987, and remains committed to further progress in 1988.

The U.S. Government believes that open markets are essential to long term sustainable growth in the world economy. Therefore, the U.S. Government will continue to promote and support measures to encourage a more open trading system. At the same time the U.S. Government will promote and support efforts to revitalize GATT. In recent years, GATT's ability to police world trade has diminished due to inadequacy of current provisions in certain areas (e.g., agriculture), disregard for its provisions by many countries, weaknesses in the GATT dispute settlement system, and the growing volume of trade. The current round of multilateral trade negotiations is reviewing the overall functioning of the GATT system and all the GATT articles, including dispute-settlement mechanisms, in this unprecedented effort to strengthen the international trading system.

The U.S. Government gives top priority to the conclusion of a comprehensive safeguards agreement—both to improve and strengthen the rules regarding emergency import restrictions and to ensure that they are based on GATT principles.

The U.S. Government gives high priority to efforts to liberalize trade in services; to extend GATT discipline to intellectual property protection; to the revision of current GATT rules investment; and to the elimination of tariffs, quotas, and subsidies which distort trade in agricultural goods. At the same time the U.S. Government will seek improvements in existing GATT subsidy rules; will focus on several practices which impede the free flow of trade in natural resource based products; and has proposed a phase out of policies and programs which distort trade in agricultural products, including many tropical products. Last year the United States presented a paper in Geneva outlining a number of ideas for improving GATT dispute settlement.

## UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)

The UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) is a principal organ of the United Nations concerned with issues of expansion of trade and fostering of economic development. Plenary sessions of the Conference meet at intervals of about four years to set policy and to outline the directions to be taken in the work program. The seventh session of the Conference, UNCTAD VII, met in Geneva, Switzerland, July 9-31.

Resolution 1995 (XIX) of a special session of the General Assembly established UNCTAD on December 30, 1964. All states which are members of the United Nations, its specialized agencies, or the International Atomic Energy Agency are eligible for membership. The executive body of the Conference, the Trade and Development Board (TDB), meets twice a year. It provides reports to the General Assembly as well as to the plenary sessions of the Conference. UNCTAD has considered the major areas of development activity including trade, money and finance, commodities, economic cooperation among developing countries, and other issues.

U.S. officials were disappointed with the results of the previous session, UNCTAD VI, held in 1983 in Belgrade, in part because extraneous political resolutions were brought up for debate. Beginning in 1984, the United States led an initiative by Western industrial countries (called Group B at UNCTAD) to reform the management of the Conference and the operation of UNCTAD programs. Secretary General Gamani Corea, often identified with a confrontational approach to North-South relations, stepped down after serving for almost 10 years. Deputy Secretary General Alister McIntyre then served as officer-in-charge for most of 1985. McIntyre initiated important reform measures to streamline the secretariat, to provide even-handed treatment of member governments (both developed and developing countries) and to improve the quality of research and documentation published by the secretariat. Measures instituted then have been maintained under the leadership of Kenneth Dadzie, who was appointed Secretary General of UNCTAD for a 3-year term beginning January 1, 1986. In addition, member governments agreed to reform measures which rationalized the meeting schedule, work program, and election of the leadership of the Trade and Development Board, the largest and single most important committee of the Conference.

Most efforts in early 1987 were directed to preparing for UNCTAD VII. By tradition, a developing country has hosted the plenary sessions, and it was the turn of the Latin American group of countries to propose a site. However, because of the escalating costs of holding this conference, Cuba was the only Latin country which extended an invitation. When it became clear that the United States would not attend the conference there, a decision was made to hold it in Geneva. After long negotiations, an extensive draft agenda was reduced to four major topics: trade, commodities, financial resources, and a review of those issues directly affecting the poorest developing countries. The U.S. delegation opposed adoption of the agenda because it did not accord sufficient emphasis to the role of the private sector as an engine of development or to the need to examine the economic policies of developing countries. The draft agenda was adopted, however, by the Trade and Development Board.

Secretary General Dadzie's preparation for the Seventh Session was unprecedented in its scope and breadth of contacts. He organized a series of preparatory consultations in regional capitals. Meetings were convened in Geneva with representatives of nongovernmental organizations, including labor, the press, and others. In response to an earlier U.S. initiative, one of these meetings was a symposium among an international group of businessmen. The symposium concluded with a number of recommendations on ways that this sector can contribute to growth and development objectives. The group proposed that permanent ties be established between the symposium and UNCTAD. Secretary General Dadzie has since taken steps to implement this proposal.

The seventh session of the Conference elected Bernard Chidzero, finance minister of Zimbabwe and a former UNCTAD Deputy Secretary General, as its president. Chidzero's acknowledged stature helped set the tone for a constructive conference. The participants in the session prepared a single document, called the Final Act, by contrast with previous sessions which produced a great number of disparate and often highly contentious resolutions. The agreed document consisted of an assessment of global economic trends and a section on recommendations for policy approaches and specific measures aimed at revitalizing development, growth, and international trade. The United States joined in the consensus in support of the Final Act, in part because it included unprecedented emphasis on the role of the private sector in developing countries. The document also points up the responsibility of the developing countries to mobilize domestic resources, as well as to encourage private capital flows in support of their development objectives.

Following the conclusion of the seventh session, various UNCTAD committees and organizations within the secretariat began to consider the ways in which the secretariat and the inter-governmental organizations should implement the provisions of the Final Act. A revision of the work program of the secretariat was prepared and forwarded to the General Assembly (Committee on Program Coordination) for approval.

In late 1987, the Trade and Development Board again took up the question of reform, in response to a resolution of the General Assembly (41/213), which called upon subsidiary organizations to provide views and recommendations on measures to improve efficiency of the ECOSOC and subordinate bodies. The response approved by the Trade and Development Board focused, in general, on procedural matters. Particularly important provisions are those which will require each of the responsible main committees (e.g. on commodities, manufactures, shipping, etc.) to review its own work program and that of the secretariat at each biennial meeting. The new rules of procedure introduce the concept of limits on the duration of work programs. This concept, often called a "sunset" rule, has been a long-sought U.S. objective. We expect that such measures will reduce expenditures on activities which no longer command the interest of the members. Other measures adopted will reduce the frequency and length of meetings, improve the procedures for setting the calendar and require greater efficiency in preparation and distribution of documentation. Perhaps most important, the changes in procedures will ensure that the review of mandates and work programs shall be a continual process and may thereby lead to more responsible and responsive work programs and products.

At the end of the year, the United States, for the first time, agreed to serve as coordinator of Group B. Our delegation in Geneva will perform this duty during the first half of 1988.

## SUBSTANTIAL NEW PROGRAM OF ACTION FOR THE LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

The Substantial New Program of Action for the 1980s for the Least Developed Countries (SNPA) was adopted by the General Assembly at its 36th session in 1981. The Program called on both the developed and developing countries to mobilize financial resources, expand trade and investment, develop and implement sound economic structural adjustment policies, and improve coordination of aid efforts throughout the remainder of the 1980s. The United States joined consensus in adopting the program but made a statement detailing the numerous reservations the United States had about the program.

In October 1985 the United States participated in UNCTAD's mid-term review of the SNPA. The mid-term review found little improvement and in some cases significant deterioration in the conditions faced by the LDCs. The United States joined other participants in reaffirming the SNPA's original objectives and balanced approach and supported the decision to have a retrospective review of the SNPA in 1990. However, the United States disassociated itself from a call for aid targets levels tied to donor countries' GNP and direct intervention in the world commodity markets through an UNCTAD-sponsored Common Fund. The 40th UN General Assembly also called for the Secretary General to report to the 42nd General Assembly on the implementation of the program to that point.

The 42nd General Assembly noted the report of the Secretary General and adopted without a vote a resolution (42/177) calling for a conference on the Least Developed Countries, bearing in mind the SNPA, to be hosted by

France in 1990. Because France will bear the expense of the conference, the United States joined consensus in adopting the resolution while reiterating the reservations expressed by the United States at the time the SNPA was originally adopted.

## Commission onTransnational Corporations

The Commission on Transnational Corporations (TNCs) was established in 1975 by ECOSOC resolution 19B (LVII) to assist the Council "in fulfilling its responsibilities in the field of transnational corporations." Its mandate includes: (1) Acting as the forum within the UN system for consideration of issues relating to transnational corporations; (2) promoting the exchange of views between and among governments and nongovernmental groups; (3) providing guidance to the Center on Transnational Corporations, and; (4) developing a Code of Conduct relating to TNCs.

In January 1986 the U.S. Government decided to limit its participation in the activities of the Commission's Secretariat, the UN Center on Transnational Corporations, because the Commission had never given the Center a clear mandate to include in its work the activities of state-owned enterprises from communist countries and TNCs from developing countries. The United States believes that this is a serious violation of the principle of universality.

The reconvened special session of the UN Commission on TNCs met April 6 to consider the next steps to be taken in regard to the Code of Conduct for TNCs. The meeting addressed procedural questions only and there were no negotiations on any of the outstanding issues. A resolution was adopted which called for intensive consultations with the aim of preparing a draft text of the code. A decision on when to next reconvene the special session will be made at the organizational session of ECOSOC in 1988.

The 13th session of the UN Commission on TNCs was held April 7-16. While there were some contentious issues, the general atmosphere was significantly better than in previous years. The Commission adopted only one formal resolution which condemned the activities of TNCs in South Africa. The United States, United Kingdom, and Switzerland voted against this resolution. Other major issues related to the scope and definition of the various activities of the Center for Transnational Corporations, including studies on transnational banks, services and the environment, as well as the extent of the Center's technical assistance to Least Developed Countries (LDCs) in the negotiation of contracts. While the work program continues in many of these areas, there are now certain limits on the various studies and services in order to minimize duplication and damaging actions. Significant progress was achieved in having the Center include enterprises from communist countries in its work. Work on the code of conduct for TNCs continued to be stalemated with no negotiations scheduled. The Commission on TNCs adopted a separate report to ECOSOC on possible reforms of the

Commission and the Center on TNCs which included U.S. proposals for biennialization of the Commission and the need to avoid duplication.

## UN Children's Fund (UNICEF)

### STRUCTURE AND FUNCTIONS

The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) was founded in 1946 to help meet the emergency needs of children in the aftermath of World War II. It now provides long-term humanitarian assistance to needy children and mothers in developing countries throughout the world, and promotes and supports health and development activities directed toward child survival and other needs of children. Because of its apolitical character and effective field presence, UNICEF has been able to operate all over the world, including areas in political turmoil such as El Salvador, Lebanon, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Angola, and Uganda. Milestones in UNICEF's history include the Nobel Prize in 1965 and the celebration of its 40th anniversary in 1986.

The Executive Director of UNICEF receives policy guidance and direction from an Executive Board composed of 41 Member States elected for 3-year terms. The United States has always been a member of this Board, which meets annually at a 2-week session. Special sessions or mail polls may be used to decide issues which cannot wait until the next regular session of the Executive Board.

### PROGRAMS

UNICEF allocates for its programs resources among countries on the basis of need, using criteria that include: infant mortality rates (IMR), infant morbidity, infant population, and per capita GNP. In 1983 the UNICEF Executive Board decided that the IMR should be the most important criterion that would "guide both the level and the content of UNICEF program cooperation." UNICEF's programs are carefully developed and tailored to the recipient country's specific needs and priorities on the basis of a child needs assessment. Rarely are UNICEF's funds the sole source of support for a program; they serve in most instances as a catalyst or critical ingredient to ensure the program's success.

UNICEF's programs emphasize developing community-level services to promote the health and well-being of children, including water supply, primary health care, nutrition, education, and improving the situation of mothers. They also assist governments in recipient countries through advisory services, inter-country exchanges, and other local training exercises. In addition, UNICEF helps procure, package, and deliver medical and other health or education supplies through its centralized supply procurement, packaging, and warehousing system, UNIPAC, located in Copenhagen, Denmark. UNICEF is the largest supplier of vaccines to countries for the

WHO Expanded Program of Immunization, which has as its goal the immunization of all the world's children against the six major childhood immunizable diseases by 1990.

In 1987 UNICEF spent $373 million on projects in 119 countries. This amount included: $150 million (40 percent) for child health activities, $24 million (6 percent) for child nutrition, $63 million (17 percent) on water supply and sanitation, $25 million (7 percent) on community and family-based services for children, $35 million (10 percent) on formal and non-formal education, $26 million (7 percent) for emergency relief, and $50 million (13 percent) for general activities—mainly planning and program preparation, program communications, and other program support.

In addition to implementing projects from general resources, UNICEF also identifies many worthwhile projects each year for which it does not have funds in its general resources. These "noted projects" are listed in an annual catalog approved by the Executive Board and are only implemented if donors contribute additional funds for a specific project. In addition, UNICEF sometimes appeals for emergency funds to assist children and mothers affected by natural or man-made disasters. In 1987 governments and intergovernmental agencies such as the Arab Gulf Fund and the European Common Market also made contributions to UNICEF in the form of supplementary funds for noted projects and emergencies. The United States donated approximately $10 million in supplementary funds in 1987, with about $7 million going to emergency assistance and child survival programs in Africa (Mozambique, Nigeria, Sudan, and Uganda), $1.4 million to Lebanon for water supply and sanitation rehabilitation, and almost $0.5 million to Haiti for child survival. The United States Agency for International Development also contributed 12,000 metric tons of food aid to support a UNICEF emergency food assistance program in Angola—not reflected in the supplementary funds.

## THE "CHILD SURVIVAL AND DEVELOPMENT REVOLUTION"

In the early 1980s, the world health community recognized that several curative and preventative health techniques had become relatively cheap, widely available—even in remote areas—and widely accepted. If these techniques were properly promoted and utilized, UNICEF reasoned, it would be possible by the year 2000 to reduce by half the number of childhood deaths (estimated at 40,000 per day) resulting from childhood immunizable diseases and dehydration from diarrheal diseases. UNICEF's so-called "Child Survival and Development Revolution" was launched in 1983, and includes the use of the four principal tools:

1. Growth Charts to detect malnutrition. These are available in 200 languages and dialects for use in some 80 countries.

2. Oral Rehydration Therapy (ORT). Diarrhea-caused dehydration is a great

killer of children. A combination of sugar and salts mixed with water not only prevents dehydration, but also allows the baby to rehydrate. This part of the Child Survival strategy dovetails well with UNICEF's traditional water supply and sanitation programs.

3. Breast-feeding. UNICEF promotes breast-feeding and proper weaning techniques as a way to prevent infant malnutrition and disease and as a natural birth-spacing technique.

4. Immunization against the six major childhood immunizable diseases — measles, diphtheria, tetanus, whooping cough, polio, and tuberculosis. Better and cheaper refrigeration networks, as well as vaccines that are less susceptible to heat and damage, make this program possible. Included in the Child Survival strategy are family spacing, food production, and female literacy.

UNICEF's approach—which, especially in the area of the use of growth charts and ORT, builds on the research and experience of the U.S. bilateral aid program—has attracted unprecedented media attention and support from the international community including endorsements from many world leaders. In 1985, the UN Secretary General wrote to the Chief of State of every UN member country to call attention to the WHO goal of achieving Universal Childhood Immunization (UCI) by 1990 and a 50 percent use of ORT by parents by 1989. Since this appeal was launched, 77 countries— with over 90 percent of the developing world's children—have informed the Secretary General of their intention to strive to achieve UCI by 1990. President Reagan twice publicly endorsed child survival activities, in 1983 and 1985, and the United States closely coordinated the maternal/child health activities of its bilateral aid program with UNICEF.

In its annual *State of the World's Children* report for 1988 (released on UNICEF's 41st anniversary, December 11, 1987), UNICEF emphasized the importance of expanding and strengthening a "Grand Alliance for Children," which it defines as "a society-wide alliance of all those who could communicate with and support parents" in applying child survival techniques such as ORT and immunization. This alliance comprises teachers and religious leaders, mass media and government agencies, voluntary organizations and people's movements, business and labor unions, professional associations, and conventional health services. The report notes that the greatest challenge to the "Grand Alliance" is to give all families the knowledge of low-cost, readily accessible child survival tools, leading to the establishment of a state of "permanent mobilization." The report underscores that great progress has been achieved. In the 1980s immunization coverage leapt from 10 to 50 percent of the developing world's children, and vaccines are estimated to save the lives of 1.4 million children yearly. ORT, virtually unknown before the 1980s outside the scientific and medical community, is now used by 20 percent of the developing world's families.

## FUNDING

Contributions to UNICEF are voluntary. In 1987 UNICEF received $266.7 million in voluntary contributions to its general resources from 121 governments. The U.S. Government contributed $51.08 million, placing it first among the contributors to the general resources and accounting for about 19.2 percent of those contributions. Other major donors, in descending order, included the Governments of Sweden ($38.2 million, 14.4 percent), Norway ($28.0 million, 10.5 percent), Italy ($27.0 million, 10.2 percent), Finland ($19.3 million, 7.3 percent), Japan ($18.0 million, 6.8 percent), Canada ($11.7 million, 4.4 percent), Netherlands ($10.8 million, 4.1 percent), and Denmark ($10.5 million, 3.9 percent).

In addition to contributions from governments, UNICEF also receives substantial income from private and other nongovernmental donors each year. Preliminary figures for 1987 show receipt of at least $82 million for 1987 from nongovernmental sources and the United Nations, plus net profits from the sale of greeting cards throughout the world. This amount represents approximately 17.6 percent of UNICEF's total net income (i.e., general resources, supplementary funds and income from contributions to emergencies).

UNICEF's success in raising funds from these sources is unique in the UN system and is largely due to the fund-raising activities of 34 national committees and 4 liaison offices. The U.S. Committee for UNICEF, a nonprofit organization which has 3 million volunteers throughout all 50 states, is the largest and among the most active of these national committees.

## 1987 SESSION OF THE UNICEF EXECUTIVE BOARD

The UNICEF Executive Board held its regular annual session in New York, April 20 - May 1. The Board again endorsed the goals of Child Survival and Development (CSD) and the reduction of infant and child mortality as a major priority and objective. While acknowledging the effectiveness of immunization campaigns, Board members expressed concern that they may transmit simplistic and misleading messages. Hence, the Board stressed the need to assure that immunization and ORT activities become a part of a comprehensive, primary health care (PHC) system. The Board reaffirmed that the sustainability, i.e., maintenance, of child survival activities is of paramount concern and the key criterion against which all program proposals must be measured. The Executive Director assured the Board of UNICEF's intention to implement CSD activities within the framework of PHC systems and basic services. He underscored UNICEF's recognition of the interrelationship between political commitment and financial, technical, and institutional sustainability. Responding to the Board's questions about program balance; i.e., fear that UNICEF places too much weight on ORT and immunization programs as opposed to other activities which also affect child health, the Executive Director cautioned against scattering UNICEF's limited resources over too broad an area. He reassured the Board, however, that expenditures for immunization campaigns will decline after 1990, as recurrent operating costs increasingly are folded into PHC expenditures of recipient countries.

The 1987 Executive Board again expressed strong support for UNICEF's continued focus on the so-called "quiet emergency" in sub-Saharan Africa, especially southern Africa. Yet some Board members, including the United States, urged UNICEF to concentrate its efforts more on building developing countries' capacity to mobilize their own financial and institutional resources and to address medium-to-long-term development needs in Africa.

Structural adjustment policies and the deteriorating global economic situation were also highlighted during the Board's general debate. The Executive Board credited UNICEF with advancing the notion of structural adjustment "with a human face." This concept highlights the need to protect the nutritional and other basic needs of the most vulnerable population groups; i.e., children and mothers, while developing country governments implement economic and fiscal reform. It also advocates restructuring social sectors— education and health, for instance—to make better use of available resources, making sure they have the greatest impact on the greatest number.

The Executive Board also commended UNICEF for its success in reducing the infant mortality rate in many areas of the developing world and, by means of "social mobilization," attracting and maintaining strong interest at the highest levels of national policy and decision-making for "putting children first" on the agenda.

The Executive Board reviewed the AIDS pandemic and strongly advised UNICEF, in collaboration with WHO, to assure strict enforcement of immunization guidelines to prevent the spread of the disease through improperly sterilized immunization equipment. Other major agenda items included a discussion of UNICEF's highly praised policy review of women in development; formal and informal education programs; water supply and sanitation; and UNICEF's role in the drafting and implementation of a UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.

The Board also raised broader policy issues, such as concern over the rise in supplementary-funded programs; i.e., noted programs, in relation to general program resources. In his response, the Executive Director urged all donors to increase their contributions to UNICEF's general resources, which provide a more secure and predictable funding base for UNICEF's work. Delegations, including the United States, also exhorted UNICEF to limit its involvement in global media events, which divert human resources and funding from its regular programs and whose "entertainment" aspect risks distracting from UNICEF's image as a serious, professional humanitarian assistance agency.

The Executive Board approved UNICEF's medium-term plan as a framework of projections for 1987-1990, including a sum of up to $222 million in program commitments from general resources. The Board also approved total expenditure estimates of $243.6 million for the 1988-1989 biennium. The Board approved by consensus a number of decisions affecting UNICEF's management and accounting procedures, including a new budget format resulting in greater clarity and limiting the Executive Director's authority to transfer between budget categories. The Board also instructed the Executive Director to report the following year on UNICEF's progress in implementing recommendations made by the UN Board of Auditors to improve UNICEF's management and accounting practices.

### U.S. PRESENCE IN UNICEF

UNICEF has its headquarters in New York. The current Executive Director is James Grant, a U.S. citizen, who has held this position since January 1, 1980. In 1984, the Secretary General announced the reappointment of Mr. Grant for another 5-year term, through December 31, 1989. U.S. citizens have held the executive directorship since UNICEF's inception.

UNICEF employs approximately 591 professionals, 84 (14 percent) of whom are U.S. citizens. Importantly, U.S. citizens occupied key policy positions including the executive directorship of UNICEF and the directorships of two out of UNICEF's six regional divisions.

### UNICEF EXPENDITURES IN THE UNITED STATES

In 1987 UNICEF spent $114.0 million in the United States. This includes $44.3 million for supplies, freight, and other services; $7.1 million in connection with its greeting card operation; and $62.6 million for staff and staff-related expenses.

## Human Settlement Activities

The Commission on Human Settlements was established in 1977 and consists of 58 members elected for 3-year terms. The Commission provides policy guidance to the Center for Human Settlements (HABITAT) located in Nairobi, Kenya. The United States has been a member since 1977; the permanent U.S. representative to the Center in Nairobi is also accredited to the UN Environment Program.

The Commission and the Center were created following the UN Conference at Vancouver, Canada, in 1976. They were designed to consolidate existing UN bodies and to provide greater emphasis to human settlements activities. The Center's responsibilities include: coordinating and reviewing all human settlements activities within the UN system; executing projects related to human settlements development; serving as a focal point for the provision and exchange of information in this area. The Center performs research, conducts training and devises training modules, carries out technical assistance projects for developing countries, and provides information on human settlements through studies, reports, and audio visual presentations.

The Tenth (Commemorative) Session of the Commission was held in Nairobi, Kenya, April 6-16. The session observed the tenth anniversary of the Commission and the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless. Unlike the Commission's normal sessions, this gathering gave equal member status to all UN members; 53 countries, in addition to 52 member-states of the Commission, attended. Representatives of 15 UN organizations, including the major specialized agencies as well as four regional economic commissions, also attended. The Director of the Office of Housing and Urban Programs, Agency for International Development headed a 10-person U.S. delegation which included four private sector advisers, among them the president-elect of the National Association of Realtors.

The 650 attendees were addressed by the President of Kenya and the Prime Minister of Sri Lanka. Many of the delegations were led by ministers or permanent secretaries having specific responsibilities for housing, human settlements, and economic development. The Commission strengthened the medium-term work plan of the Center by providing emphasis on shelter for the homeless, called for increased cooperation between the Center and the UN Environment Program, and requested a determination of priorities by the Secretariat for greater cooperation with other UN agencies.

During the debate on shelter and services for the poor, a number of delegations publicly thanked the United States for its assistance in this area. Statements by the U.S. delegation emphasized the role of the private sector in the creation of housing and human settlements, with governments acting as facilitators through appropriate enabling strategies. Owing partly to the efforts of U.S. delegations to earlier Commission meetings, this overall theme was also prominent in documents prepared by HABITAT, as well as in the work plans for coming years prepared by the Secretariat. Many delegations from industrialized states and from developing countries strongly supported the U.S. approach. The U.S. delegation participated actively in shaping the structure and priorities of the medium-term plan for 1990-95 and supported in its submission to the Special Commission of ECOSOC the continuation of HABITAT as a discrete body within the UN system. In view of proposals to combine HABITAT and UNEP, the U.S. delegation argued that the responsibilities of HABITAT and the issues the organization dealt with were very different from those of UNEP. The U.S. delegation took a strong position on keeping HABITAT's focus specifically on human settlements.

The U.S. delegation produced a draft resolution entitled "National Shelter Coalitions" which, with the close cooperation of Indonesia, was adopted by consensus. This resolution emphasizes the importance of public/private partnerships, secure tenure of property, and the need to solve problems of housing low-income families through affordable programs. As a result of U.S.

efforts begun in 1985, the Commission adopted as its theme for the Twelfth Session (1989) the roles of governments, non-governmental organizations, and the private sector in addressing human settlements problems and providing low-cost housing.

The United States contributed $400,000 to the Center in 1987, specifying this amount for the activities of the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless.

## Population Activities

The UN Secretary General established the UN Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA) in 1967 as a special trust fund. Renamed the UN Population Fund in 1987, it operates under the guidance of ECOSOC and, since 1972, with the general oversight of the Governing Council of the UN Development Programme (UNDP). UNFPA is second only to the U.S. Government itself as a source of assistance for population activities in developing countries. It has an annual budget of $140 million and finances projects in over 120 countries. The Fund is working to devote an increasing ratio of its resources to family planning activities per se, to confine its commitment levels to reasonable expectations, and to retain sufficient flexibility so that the assistance will be geared to the circumstances of the recipient country.

Dr. Nafis Sadik of Pakistan, long a senior official of the Fund, assumed the duties of Executive Director following the sudden death of the first Executive Director, Rafael Salas.

Based on Congressional legislation which stipulates that none of the funds made available under Public Law 99-88, the supplemental appropriations act, may be made available to any organization or program which, as determined by the President of the United States, supports or participates in the management of a program of coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization, the Administration has made no payment in 1986 and 1987. Because of the characteristics of the family planning program in the People's Republic of China and UNFPA's financial support for that program, this legislation was determined by the U.S. AID Administrator to apply to UNFPA, and the Administration consequently withheld $10 million of the U.S. pledge of $46 million for FY 1985. Since there was no significant change in the UNFPA program in the China or in the Chinese population program itself, the Administration made no contribution to the Fund for FY 1986 or FY 1987. The UNFPA and the Government of China have separately disputed the U.S. claims. China denies that it condones, much less encourages, coercive abortion and involuntary sterilization. UNFPA denies it manages or contributes to such activity in China or elsewhere.

While, in 1987, the Fund had nearly returned to the level of contributions reached before the termination of U.S. support, owing primarily to favorable exchange movements and several one-time special contributions, there was widespread concern among the members at the 34th session of the Governing Council for resource prospects in the light of new undertakings in Africa. Several countries alluded to or actually mentioned the United States in discussing the questions about ability of the Fund to meet both obligations and expectations. Sweden, in particular, called upon the United States to reconsider its decision on contributing to UNFPA.

Despite the fact that it has made no contribution to UNFPA, the United States remains an active participant in UNFPA's governing body. The 34th session of the Governing Council conducted a serious and noncontentious debate of UNFPA policies, programs, and resources. It praised Salas for his vital contributions to the Fund and the universal cause of slowing world population growth.

The Council approved programs totaling nearly $112 million, including 31 large-scale, multi-year country programs and intercountry programs, the latter totaling $3.95 million. At the same time, Council members called for increased coordination with such other UN agencies as UNICEF and WHO. In a significant innovation, the Council called upon governments to present their UNDP and UNFPA country programs to the same session of the Council whenever possible in order to ensure their complementarity and consistency.

UNFPA submitted a report focused on substantive aspects of project implementation, including common obstacles and strategies for improving the quality of these activities. This excited considerable interest. The United States supported a proposal to discuss the findings in detail in the Council's Working Group, as part of its consideration of possibilities for improving the quality of project design and implementation. Subsequently, in the Working Group, Executive Director Sadik indicated that UNFPA is experimenting with a "progress payment" scheme in Latin America under which UNFPA would time its reimbursement to UN agencies implementing UNFPA projects according to the actual pace and success of project activities. Such an agreement would give UNFPA greater control over field activities and implementing agencies.

Dr. Sadik proposed that UNFPA formally be renamed the UN Population Fund in order to avoid possible confusion with other family planning groups and for reasons of simplicity. The acronym, UNFPA, would be retained. In giving its approval, the Council stipulated that this change in title "in no way changes, nor will change, the present mandate, aims, and purpose of UNFPA or the role and functions of the Governing Council . . . , the Economic and Social Council, and the General Assembly with respect to UNFPA."

The United States welcomed the Fund's plans for assistance to sub-Saharan Africa, commending UNFPA's carefully designed strategy to guide expansion of assistance to the priority country needs in the region. The United

States emphasized its commitment to meet the needs of African countries for population assistance.

Assuring the Fund of cooperation in program coordination efforts in all countries where U.S. AID and UNFPA are partners in providing population assistance, the U.S. spokesman promised to work with the Fund on matters of common concern. The United States, he said, will continue its commitment to programs designed to slow population growth, promote economic development, and respect internationally recognized human rights.

The Council approved an appropriation of $59,523,700 for the 1988-1989 biennium, which sum was to be offset by credits and miscellaneous income totaling $4.2 million. The Fund was commended for measures taken to effect savings in all categories of expenditure, including staffing.

## The World Food Council

The UN General Assembly created the World Food Council (WFC) pursuant to resolution 22 of the 1974 World Food Conference. The Council offers advice and recommendations on world food and agricultural problems and policy issues. The WFC performs this function primarily through its annual ministerial session. The Council is composed of 36 member states elected by the General Assembly to represent the various regions of the world. The United States and the U.S.S.R. have been members of WFC continuously since its establishment. The WFC Secretariat is headed by Gerald Trant (Canada). He has a staff of 12 professionals and a budget of $1.8 million per year. One U.S. citizen professional is employed in the organization.

WFC held its 13th Ministerial Session in Beijing, China, June 8-12. As principal topics, the Council's agenda included "The Global State of Hunger and the Impact of Economic Adjustment on Food and Hunger Problems," "The Impact of International Agricultural Trade and Related National Policies on Food and Development," and "Regional Cooperation and North-South Cooperation in Food and Agriculture."

The U.S. delegation was led by Deputy Secretary of Agriculture Peter Myers. In his statements, he said that food aid functions as a short-term stopgap measure, and that the real solution to poverty and hunger lies in programs that promote long-term economic growth and sustained economic vitality; that developing countries need to adjust to a more limited flow of external resources in the future; and that long-term sustained economic growth will not reach its potential until the world's trading partners agree to bring agriculture more closely in line with the GATT's fundamental philosophy of a trading market based on market and price forces.

The tone of the conference in Beijing was candid but nonconfrontational. In general, the delegations of developing countries called for increased development assistance from multilateral organizations. A broad consensus developed around the concepts that strained international economic conditions are making access to food more difficult, that poverty is the heart of the hunger problem, and that fundamental changes in national policies are required to eliminate hunger.

The impact of national trade policies on the international food situation was considered the most important issue of the agenda. The WFC Secretariat presented a paper recommending a decrease in farm subsidies, a decoupling of farm income from production, and emphasis on a trading system based on market forces. The paper strongly condemned protectionism in agricultural trade policies. While many delegations were quick to make defensive statements in response to the Secretariat's position, the U.S. delegation expressed support for liberalization of agricultural trade.

## SOCIAL ISSUES

### Crime Prevention and Control

The United States joined consensus on an Italian draft resolution approved by the UN General Assembly on the subject of crime prevention and criminal justice. The resolution focused on ways and means of implementing the Milan Plan of Action.* In particular, resolution 42/59 encouraged the cooperation of member states with the work of UN regional and interregional institutes for crime prevention and control and endorsed recommendations from the Economic and Social Council related to the preparation of the Eighth Congress on the Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders, to be held in 1990. The resolution also requested the Secretary General to redeploy staff and funds to the UN program of work in crime prevention and criminal justice.

### Committee on Crime Prevention and Control

The Committee on Crime Prevention and Control did not meet in 1987.

### Drug Abuse Control

During 1987 the United States continued to utilize the UN system to pursue key international drug control goals. A major achievement in this area, for the United Nations and the United States, was the highly successfulInternational Conference on Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking,(ICDAIT) which was convened June 17-26, in Vienna, Austria. Another major success was the continuing progress made in drafting a new international convention against drug trafficking. These two initiatives, along with the regular efforts of the United Nations, helped demonstrate that drug control has become a high priority UN activity which member states view as universally important. To assure the success of these initiatives in particular, and continued progress on other drug control endeavors, the United States provided material and personnel resources and worked through the three UN intergovernmental bodies most involved in drug control activities—the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (CND), the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) and the UN General Assembly. Furthermore, the U.S. Secretariat for ICDAIT worked in close collaboration with the UN ICDAIT Secretariat.

---

*The Milan Plan of Action highlighted three areas of transnational crime as the subject areas warranting efforts over the next several years: (a) organized crime, (b) illicit drug trafficking, and (c) criminal acts of a terrorist nature.

The United States also worked closely with UN member states from all regions to assure that the international conference was successful, that progress was made on the new convention, and that the UN drug control program activities, at the country level, continued to gain wide support. Several governments continued to elevate the priority of activities to fight all aspects of the drug problem—drug abuse, illicit production, and trafficking.

Many governments continued to devote additional resources to the fight against the drug problem. Contributions again increased to the UN Fund for Drug Abuse Control (UNFDAC), a voluntary fund established in 1971 through U.S. efforts. An American continued to serve as UNFDAC Deputy Director and, as elsewhere in the UN system, efforts continued to ensure the employment of U.S. citizens in suitable positions in appropriate levels.

Vice President George Bush demonstrated his interest in international drug control by discussing the issue with the U.S. delegation to ICDAIT. The First Lady, Mrs. Nancy Reagan, continued her involvement in international drug control by discussing the concerns of mothers with her counterparts, particularly in an official visit to Sweden. She also prepared a film for use at ICDAIT, which was widely disseminated and praised. Also, in relation to the International Conference, President Reagan made clear his commitment to international drug control in an opening message to the Conference and during "welcome home" remarks congratulating the U.S. delegation.

The U.S. private sector, especially relevant nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) was visibly involved in ICDAIT. American NGOs played a major role in the organization of the ICDAIT NGO Forum. The U.S. Government assisted these efforts, so that maximum NGO participation in ICDAIT was assured.

## UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND ECOSOC

The 42nd UN General Assembly commended the successful completion of ICDAIT and gave serious attention to its results. Also, the Assembly called on the CND to formulate specific recommendations for national, regional, and international follow-up. (Resolution 42/112.) In resolution 42/111, the Assembly endorsed progress made on the new convention against illicit traffic in narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances, urging that the convention be completed as soon as possible. A third General Assembly resolution, 42/113, called on the Secretary General to strengthen the UN drug control elements so that even more support could be given to countries. All three resolutions passed by consensus and all delegations which spoke noted the high worldwide priority of drug control.

Speaking for the United States, the Assistant Secretary of State for International Narcotic Matters, Ann B. Wrobleski, delivered a General Assembly intervention which helped maintain the momentum generated by ICDAIT. In assessing the momentous progress made during 1987, Assistant Secretary Wrobleski noted that "the United Nations has good reason to be proud of its leadership in bringing nations together in a commitment to action against drug production, trafficking, and abuse. The United Nations is in an ideal position to solve the drug problem because it is one which affects all people and cannot be solved without the community of nations acting together in a common purpose".

At the Economic and Social Council, which met in May, the member states adopted eight resolutions and six decisions concerning drug control, most of which were sent to it by the CND. The Council also elected or reelected, 20 member states to serve 4-year terms on the CND. The United States was one of the members reelected.

Most of the statements made during the ECOSOC debate expressed concern about the world drug abuse situation and noted the need for increased international cooperation to combat drug abuse and illicit trafficking. The International Conference and the new convention also were addressed by all speakers. Speaking for the United States, Ambassador Patricia M. Byrne noted that "the convening of a ministerial-level international conference is an important milestone in the fight against drug abuse and illicit trafficking." Ambassador Byrne also expressed the United States' appreciation to the Secretary General for calling for the conference and helping to assure that preparations had been so successful.

## COMMISSION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS

The 32nd regular session of the 40-member Commission on Narcotic Drugs (CND)* convened in Vienna on February 2-11. Assistant Secretary Wrobleski led the U.S. Delegation, which included representatives ofthe Departments of State, Justice, Health and Human Services, Commerce, and Treasury (the U.S. Customs Service). The CND approved seven draft resolutions and four draft decisions for ECOSOC consideration and adopted six resolutions and seven decisions which did not require ECOSOC action.

---

*Members in 1987 were: Algeria, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Finland, France, Germany, Democratic Republic of, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iran, Italy, Madagascar, Morocco, The Netherlands, Pakistan, Peru, Sri Lanka, Thailand, United States, Yugoslavia. (Terms expire December 1987.) Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, China, Ecuador, Hungary, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, Nigeria, Senegal, Soviet Union, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom, Venezuela, Zambia (Terms expire December 1989).)

The draft resolutions prepared for and later adopted by ECOSOC included instructions on the further preparation of the new antidrug trafficking convention, a call for improved preventive education activities, endorsements of better techniques to control the international trade in psychotropic substances and to balance the supply for and demand of opiates, and an expression of support for the existing UN drug agencies. The CND resolutions and decisions included several which endorsed measures designed to improve law enforcement cooperation and training.

Following the regular CND session, the Commission met as the Preparatory Body for the International Conference (February 12-18). During both meetings, Ambassador Enrique Parejo, former Colombian Minister of Justice, served as chairman. His chairmanship was particularly welcomed by the United States since he was recovering from an assassination attempt, financed by drug traffickers, which almost took his life less than a month before the CND session. In seconding Parejo's nomination, Assistant Secretary Wrobleski saluted his leadership, dignity, courage, and humanity.

## DRAFT CONVENTION AGAINST ILLICIT TRAFFIC IN NARCOTIC DRUGS AND PSYCHOTROPIC SUBSTANCES

Considerable progress was made on drafting the new antidrug trafficking convention during 1987. A preliminary draft text was prepared by the Division of Narcotic Drugs (DND), based upon a 1986 CND Resolution drafted by the U.S. delegation. The CND established an open-ended expert working group of government representatives to negotiate the final draft text of articles for the convention. During the CND, three draft articles were completed by the working group and progress was made on definitions to be used in the convention. The 1987 CND also called for a Plenipotentiary Conference to be held in 1988 to adopt the completed convention and open it for signature.

Later in 1987, the intergovernmental working group of experts met twice to elaborate further the articles of the convention, its preamble, final clauses, and implementing provisions, for consideration at the 1988 CND session. These measures met basic U.S. goals for the preparation of this convention. All the U.S. experts participating in the U.S. intergovernmental working group of experts, (representatives of the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce (U.S. Customs Service) and Transportation (U.S. Coast Guard), considered completion of the convention a high priority, and considerable governmental resources were dedicated to the effort.

For its part, the United Nations (i.e. the DND) has performed efficiently to assure all the deliberations efforts have proceeded in a cooperative spirit. ECOSOC and the General Assembly have called for completion of the convention in 1988.

## DRUG SCHEDULING

An ongoing responsibility of the CND is to place narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances under the international control provisions of the two international drug control conventions. In 1987 the CND placed five psychotropic substances into control schedules of the 1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances: Butalbital (5-allyl-5-isobutyl barbituric acid) was placed in schedule III and; Allobarbital (5, 5-diallylbarbituric acid), Butobarbital (5-butyl-5-ethyl barbituric acid) and secbutabarbital (5-sec-butyl-5-ethylbarbituric acid), were placed in schedule IV. The U.S. delegation voted in favor of each approved scheduling decision.

## OTHER CND ACTION

In addition to work on the new antitrafficking convention and the scheduling of psychotropic substances, the Commission reviewed the situation and trends in drug abuse and illicit trafficking. It was noted that the trafficking situation continued to deteriorate world wide. The disturbing trend of "crack" usage (a smokeable form of cocaine noted for potency) was the subject of increasing concern.

The 1987 CND also discussed an important measure undertaken in August 1986 to combat the increasing trafficking problem—the first interregional meeting of Heads of National Law Enforcement Agencies (HONLEA). Eighty-five countries were represented at the meeting. Its concluding recommendations emphasized practical law enforcement measures which governments, intergovernmental bodies, and international organizations could undertake with expediency. Actions also were taken by the CND to initiate a regular system of regional HONLEA meetings.

## UN DRUG CONTROL AGENCIES

As of March 1, the UN Secretary General appointed Ms. Margaret Joan Anstee (United Kingdom) to serve as Coordinator of UN Drug-Related Activities. Ms. Anstee is also Director General of the UN Office at Vienna. As Coordinator, Ms. Anstee is performing a function previously carried out by William B. Buffum, now retired, who was stationed in UN headquarters and oversaw the major issues related to the UN drug agencies.

The UN Division of Narcotic Drugs (DND) carried out a program of activities which emphasized the provision of practical technical and scientific assistance to member states, in addition to its extensive work in preparing the new draft convention and in support of the ICDAIT. Francisco Ramos-Galino (Spain) was confirmed as the DND Director; he had previously served as Deputy Director and Acting Director. During the CND session, the Division received special praise for the work of its laboratory and for the convening of various expert group meetings.

The UN Fund for Drug Abuse Control (UNFDAC), under the leadership of Executive Director Guiseppe Di Gennaro (Italy), continued to expand its program activities during 1987. A total of 114 sectoral projects were undertaken in 35 countries. The large financial resources made avialable to the Fund permitted increased activities in Asia, Latin America, and the Near and Middle East, as well as the development of plans for the regions of Africa and the Caribbean. Large UNFDAC-financed opium control programs continued in Asia and coca-control operations expanded in the Andean Subregion, in Bolivia, Colombia, Equador, and Peru.

As a concrete demonstration of governments' endorsement of UNFDAC and its work, 55 countries pledged and/or contributed $34.1 million in 1987. The United States pledged $1.32 million. A multi-year pledge of $300 million, the largest in the Fund's history, was made by Italy. For the first time, three Eastern European countries made pledges. According to UNFDAC estimates, the Fund spent approximately $24.3 million in 1987, the bulk of which went to reduce the supply of illicit narcotics and to strengthen control measures, including law enforcement.

The United States continued to play a leadership role in guiding the work of the Fund. Rapid expansion of UNFDAC's activities was expected to continue. The Fund remained the key multilateral tool in the global struggle against the drug problem. It received strong, universal support during 1987 for its action-oriented approach, its successful fund-raising, and its program expansion in all regions.

The 1987 Report of the International Narcotics Control Board (INCB) maintained the Board's hard-hitting, and frank approach. The report led some governments (Cuba, Lebanon, Bolivia) to suggest that the Board "should clarify" its remarks about the character of the drug problems in their countries.

In his summary of the 1987 INCB Report, the Board President, Shaibyada Ali Kahn (Pakistan), drew special attention to the spread of drug abuse into areas hitherto unaffected, particularly sub-Saharan Africa. He stressed that drug abuse was leading to the alarming spread of AIDS. Also, the Board's report generated serious expressions of concern about the severe financial and personnel resource constraints under which the Board was laboring. U.S. Delegate Wrobleski noted that the Secretary of State had said that the work of the Board was key to the implementation of the international drug control conventions. Overall, the Board and its Secretariat received high praise for efficiently and effectively monitoring the world situation.

## INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON DRUG ABUSE AND ILLICIT TRAFFICKING (ICDAIT)

The International Conference on Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking (ICDAIT) was held in Vienna, Austria, from June 17 to 26. The Conference was attended by representatives of 138 countries as well as most international agencies and a large number of nongovernmental organizations concerned with the drug issue. The U.S. delegation achieved the goals and objectives established prior to the meeting.

During the Conference, the U.S. Delegation made two major interventions—a message from President Reagan to the Conference and a plenary statement on U.S. policy and programs. Also during the Conference, the Senate passed a resolution in support of the U.S. Delegation's participation at ICDAIT. The President welcomed the Delegation back to the United States on July 1 and expressed his appreciation for the preparations and achievements of the delegation and the Conference, which, he stated, "demonstrated that good planning and strong execution will lead to positive results in UN meetings."

In preparation for the Conference, during 1987, the CND met as the preparatory body in February. It completed the draft Rules of Procedure for the Conference; it finished the text of the major conference document, the Comprehensive Multidisciplinary Outline of Future Activities in Drug Abuse Control (CMO), and it initiated drafting of a Declaration of Political Will. These documents were adopted by consensus at the Conference. In both the Declaration and the CMO, U.S. language and priorities largely prevailed.

In addition to the Conference documents, there were several other important issues. The election of the President of the Conference was in contention for a year prior to the Conference. The contest between Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir bin Mohamad and Bolivian Foreign Minister Bedregal-Gutierrez, was resolved just as the Conference opened. The U.S.-supported candidate, Mahathir, was elected by acclamation to serve as President, and Bedregal accepted Chairmanship of the Conference Main Committee. The election of other Conference officers was not controversial. The United States was elected to serve as one of 24 Conference vice presidents.

In summary, the Conference was considered by U.S. Delegates to be a success due to the following accomplishments:

— Consensus ministerial-level approval of the Declaration established the clear political commitment of all 138 participating governments to take effective measures, including the provision of resources, to confront all aspects of the drug problem collectively and individually.

— The Conference debate established the drug problem as a shared international problem affecting elements of all societies and regions. It also helped establish the reinforcing nature of drug abuse, production, and trafficking with no single aspect seen as the root cause of the problem.

— Adoption of the CMO, which outlined activities all interested parties should undertake, provided an important tool which could serve as a compendium of effective measures and help assure future efforts are balanced, comprehensive, and effective.

— The important role the UN must play in confronting the drug problem was recognized, and commitments were made to strengthen the drug control bodies and the existing international drug control conventions.

— The new convention against drug trafficking was strongly endorsed and the likelihood of its rapid completion was enhanced.

— The nonpoliticized nature of the Conference demonstrated that such global meetings can function effectively and provide positive results when all are committed to operating by full consensus.

— Existing relationships between countries were strengthened and new areas for cooperation were identified.

— Public diplomacy activities, especially in foreign countries, increased public awareness of the international character of the drug problem and conveyed the commitment of the United States, other governments, and the United Nations to take effective action.

**U.S. Government Preparations.** The United States strongly supported all preparations for the Conference. During the year and a half preceding the Conference, the United States provided expert staff to the United Nations to help in planning. To assist in the initial drafting of the CMO, the consultant services of an American expert were provided by the U.S. Government. For the year preceding the Conference, a staff officer from the White House Drug Abuse Policy Office was detailed to the UN Conference Secretariat.

After the Conference was proposed, U.S. Government officials met regularly with all key UN conference planning officials in Vienna, New York, and Washington. Similar meetings were conducted during the Conference to enhance coordination of bilateral and multilateral drug control programs following the Conference.

In working with other key governments to prepare for the Conference U.S. officials maintained a regular pattern of consultations in capitals, New York and Vienna. Background and instruction cables were sent to all foreign posts to generate support for U.S. priorities. Throughout the time preceding the conference, and particularly at preparatory meetings, special attention was given to forming issue-based coalitions with other countries and to the discouragement of traditional UN voting blocs. In preparing for the Conference, U.S. Government officials also established ongoing communication with representatives of the many nongovernmental organizations which planned to participate in the Conference. Approximately fifty U.S. NGOs were informed about the Conference and urged by letter to participate. A large 1-day meeting, sponsored by the UN Association and convened at the Department of State, reviewed all aspects of the Conference and high-level, U.S. Government officials provided background on ICDAIT. Members of the U.S. delegation addressed the NGO sessions and participated in the discussions. The U.S. private sector was represented on the official U.S. delegation to the Conference.

Reflecting the U.S. commitment to NGO involvement in ICDAIT, the United States contributed funding to encourage Conference attendance by NGO representatives. This funding was specifically designated to defray travel costs for NGO representatives from developing countries who would otherwise have been unable to attend.

Recognizing the crucial role that public awareness plays in combatting drug abuse, the United States also contributed $60,000 to a trust fund established by the United Nations to support public information efforts related to the Conference. The funds received from governments, NGOs, and private individuals through this trust fund were allocated to promote a campaign of drug abuse education, prevention, and awareness.

The Department of State established from October 1986 to August 1987 a Secretariat to coordinate U.S. preparations for the Conference and immediate follow-up activities. The staff of the U.S. Secretariat was drawn from the State Department and the Department of Justice. F. Gray Handley of the Department of State's Bureau of International Organization Affairs, was named Coordinator of the Secretariat. During the period of the Conference an enhanced secretariat unit and office were established at the U.S. delegation's hotel with the support of the U.S. Mission to the UN Agencies in Vienna and the U.S. Embassy. Briefings were conducted with Congressional staff members in November 1986 and March, May, June, and July 1987.

**U.S. Delegation.** The United States was represented at the Conference by a high-level delegation. Attorney-General Edwin Meese III led the Delegation. Vernon A. Walters, U.S. Representative to the United Nations, and John C. Whitehead, Deputy Secretary of State, served as alternate Heads of Delegation. The Assistant Secretary of State for International Narcotic Matters, Ambassador Ann B. Wrobleski, served as Ranking Delegate, and Ambassador Bruce K. Chapman, the U.S. Permanent Representative to the UN Agencies in Vienna, served as Senior Delegate. Officials from 15 U.S. Government agencies directly involved in the drug control effort also served on the delegation.

The White House Office for Drug Abuse Policy and the Office of the Vice

President also were represented. In addition, the Secretary of State invited the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House to nominate four delegates from Congress. Congressmen Charles Rangel and Benjamin Gilman served on the Delegation.

In order to reflect the broad-based concern about the drug problem within the United States, six community leaders from outside the Federal government were invited to serve on the Delegation. They were selected to represent several key elements in the national drug control effort including the medical community, the legal community, state law enforcement, local law enforcement, and parent/community drug abuse prevention organizations.

Prior to the Conference, Vice President George Bush opened a 2-day briefing session at the Department of State. Extensive briefing materials and guidance were provided to the delegates. Security and administrative arrangements and effective negotiating strategies were outlined. A luncheon, given by Acting Secretary of State John Whitehead, enabled key foreign ambassadors to meet the U.S. Delegation and to be briefed on U.S. objectives.

The delegation traveled to and from the Conference via Presidential aircraft. Meetings held every morning during the Conference helped the Delegation function as a well organized team carrying out designated assignments.

**Public Relations Support.** Because a central objective of the Conference was to raise the level of national and international awareness with regard to the drug problem, several public information activities were undertaken prior to and during the Conference. Of particular note was the production of an antidrug abuse film cohosted by Mrs. Reagan and Mrs. Perez de Cuellar (the wife of UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar). The film focused on the efforts of first ladies from many countries who had been active in the fight against drug abuse. It demonstrated the international character of the problem and the importance of active, high-level involvement of concerned mothers and leaders. This film was produced with the aid of the U.S. Information Agency in cooperation with the United Nations. It was premiered at United Nations Headquarters in New York in early June and it was shown repeatedly during the Conference in Vienna. Both events received considerable media attention and several countries requested copies for screening in their own media.

The U.S. Information Agency also initiated other conference-related projects. Worldnet television coverage and wireless file news coverage helped publicize the U.S. point of view. Voice of America press, interview, and language services also were provided. Numerous interviews with U.S. delegates were undertaken in Vienna and distributed in the foreign media.

The United States also prepared a "country report" which was widely disseminated at the Conference. The report described the wide range of U.S. drug education, enforcement, and treatment efforts being undertaken domestically and internationally. The report highlighted projects at the community and state level as well as those sponsored by the Federal government.

For the duration of the Conference, the United States presented a multifaceted exhibit at the conference center. It featured a series of topic-oriented displays and videotapes designed to explain U.S. drug control efforts. A film focusing on the latest scientific breakthroughs in drug-related research was prepared for and presented at the exhibit. Additional videotapes were shown to illustrate successful innovations in drug enforcement. A multilingual expert staff served as resource persons in the U.S. exhibit. Workshops on research and treatment also were conducted using panels of U.S. experts.

A public information campaign also was undertaken within the United States. Background information and press releases were made available to the media. Press conferences by delegation principals were held and press announcements drew attention to the importance of the Conference. During the Conference, interviews were given by delegation principals to the NBC "Today Show", *Newsweek, The New York Times,* Mutual Radio, CBS Radio and other important media organizations. Following the Conference, the press also was invited to the President's "welcome home" ceremony.

Running concurrently with the intergovernmental conference, nongovernmental organizations involved in combating the drug problem held a forum of workshops, presentations, discussion groups, and site visits. Members of the U.S. delegation and other U.S. experts participated extensively in forum activities and in many cases served as the main resource people. A particularly useful aspect of the forum was the establishment of international networks which should lead to ongoing contact and support. At the conclusion of the forum, participants prepared a plan to help guide their future activities. These activities will be supported by a standing NGO committee which plans to work closely with the UN drug control bodies.

On June 22 parliamentarians from 17 countries met to discuss the important role legislative bodies have in confronting the drug problem. The United States was represented by an expert staff member of the House Select Committee on Narcotic Abuse. The meeting helped lay the ground work for the interparliamentary Conference on Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking in the Western Hemisphere held in Caracas, Venezuela, November 9-13.

## UN Disaster Relief Office (UNDRO)

Problems of uncoordinated relief efforts in a series of major disasters in the late 1960s convinced members of the United Nations that a distinct office was needed to help organize the emergency assistance which individual governments, UN agencies, the Red Cross, and other voluntary societies provide. In March 1972 the UN Disaster Relief Office (UNDRO), subsequently renamed the Office of the UN Disaster Relief Coordinator, was established to mobilize relief more rapidly; coordinate it more systematically; and reduce waste, duplication, and failure in the supply of essential items. UNDRO was also given responsibility for improving contingency planning and disaster preparedness worldwide and for harnessing modern scientific and technological knowledge to prevent and mitigate disasters.

UNDRO's mandate is three-fold: to mobilize, direct, and coordinate relief activities among organizations of the UN system; to assist governments of stricken countries to assess relief needs, disseminate that information, and coordinate the donors' response; and to promote disaster prevention and preparedness activities. Disaster relief coordination is the core of the activities of UNDRO and receives the highest priority in the allocation of resources.

The UN Disaster Relief Coordinator, whose term is normally coterminous with that of the UN Secretary General, reports directly to the Secretary General. In early 1987 the Secretary General extended the term of the current UNDRO Coordinator, M'Hamed Essaafi of Tunisia, for two more years (1987-1988).

UNDRO played an active role in 1987 in coordinating relief efforts throughout the world where natural disasters occurred. In the fall of 1987 UNDRO Director and Deputy to the Coordinator, Hans Einhaus (Austria), headed a UN interagency mission to Lebanon, and major donors were expected to assess needs and priorities by early 1988 based on the mission's findings. The mission recommended $85 million in immediate relief and economic aid to the strife-torn country. In November UNDRO appealed for urgent contributions towards an airlift operation in Ethiopia to provide emergency food supplies to half a million Ethiopians seriously threatened by an unexpected drought and civil strife. Throughout the year under review, UNDRO also coordinated relief efforts in:

— Angola, Mali, Mozambique, Chad (armed conflict, famine, displaced persons);
— Comoros Islands, Cook Islands, Fiji, Philippines (cyclones, typhoons);
— El Salvador (earthquake rehabilitation), Ecuador, Chile (earthquakes);
— Haiti, China (fire);
— Haiti, Madagascar, Bolivia, Bangladesh, Chile, Nepal, Guatemala, Lesotho (floods);
— Nigeria (epidemic);
— Sahel region (with FAO) (drought, famine).

Since 1984-1985, the widespread emergency situation in Africa involving 18 countries and an estimated 30 million people has dominated UNDRO's activities. Senior staff members from UNDRO supported the UN Office for

Emergency Operations in Africa (OEOA), an exceptional and temporary mechanism established by the Secretary General, while continuing to carry out the functions falling under UNDRO's own mandate. UNDRO cooperated closely with many organizations in the UN system and other intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations involved in humanitarian relief. UNDRO established and reinforced national focal points for disaster management information. For example, in Sudan and Chad, units were created to serve government relief committees and individual donors in the collection, recording, analysis, and dissemination of information on the emergency situation.

Although the OEOA was officially disbanded in 1986, the Africa emergency in 1987 continued to be an issue of serious concern for UN agencies, the international donor community, and UNDRO. Prolonged destabilization and consequent displacement of civilians— notably in Ethiopia, Mozambique, Angola, and Chad—coupled with drought and crop failure, created an urgent need of food assistance, medical supplies, and other types of relief assistance. In Mozambique, UNDRO assigned in March 1987 a senior delegate as adviser and emergency liaison officer to the UN Special Coordinator. At the request of the Chadian Government, two UNDRO representatives were dispatched to study the coordination and mobilization of emergency aid to persons displaced as a result of civil strife. Finally, UNDRO pursued its cooperative efforts with the UN Food and Agriculture Organization in the rapid dissemination of information on locust and grasshopper infestation in the Sahel.

In the area of disaster preparedness and prevention, UNDRO participated in and cosponsored studies, seminars, missions, and projects concerning, *inter alia*, seismic risk reduction, disaster mitigation, information systems development, tropical cyclones, mudflow prevention, and disaster management training. UNDRO also established fellowships in preparedness training, to be financed by voluntary contributions from governments.

## DECADE OF NATURAL DISASTERS REDUCTION

On December 11 the 42nd General Assembly adopted by consensus a resolution (42/169) designating the 1990s as a decade in which the international community will devote special attention to the goal of reducing natural disasters. UNDRO's New York liaison office actively promoted the decade concept and cochaired (with the UN Development Program) a conference at UN Headquarters to garner the support of member states. The United States did not cosponsor the resolution, since it will probably entail financial obligations to the UN system, but it did not block consensus for such a decade -- whose objectives it applauds and supports. The United States had opposed an earlier draft resolution proposing a UN-sponsored International Decade on this subject.

## REFORM OF UNDRO

In UN resolution 41/201, the General Assembly requested the Secretary General to submit to the 42nd General Assembly through the ECOSOC a report on the implementation of the resolution, "including a comprehensive review and assessment of the existing mechanisms and arrangements within the system for disaster and emergency assistance and coordination." The United States, which in 1986 had concluded that UNDRO "had not lived up to its potential" and stood in need of basic reform, saw in 1987 a potential impetus to achieve positive change, especially in the wake of the recently released report by the Group of 18 High-Level Experts (G-18) recommending numerous reforms to enhance the efficiency of the UN system. Two of the G-18 report's recommendations made specific proposals for improving the coordinating of the UN system to emergency, humanitarian, and economic assistance programs, and suggested that the UNDP "consider the feasibility of taking over the functions" of UNDRO.

The United States announced at the second session of the 1987 ECOSOC in July its reform proposals for UNDRO. The major points of the U.S. position were:

— UNDRO should become a much more active participant in disaster relief coordination at the site of disasters by shifting operational emphasis to the field;

— UNDRO's Geneva headquarters should become primarily a data processing and information dissemination center supporting emergency operations, with the bulk of responsibility transferred to the field;

— UNDRO is too small and specialized to take the lead in complex disasters, such as locusts or drought, and should limit itself to relief coordination and information dissemination for short-term disasters.

— Some of UNDRO's Geneva-based personnel posts should be shifted to regional centers around the world, where roving disaster relief specialists would advise governments and local UNDP resident representatives and participate in implementing UNDP-funded disaster prevention and preparedness projects.

— UNDRO's relationship with UNDP should be strengthened through administrative mechanisms, but UNDRO should not be submerged in the UNDP structure, as suggested by the G-18 Report.

While many supported much of the U.S. reform proposal, some members expressed preference for awaiting the Secretary General's report to the 42nd General Assembly, pursuant to the instructions set forth in General Assembly resolution 41/201, before taking further action on the issue. To comply fully with resolution 41/201, the Secretary General had engaged a special consultant to undertake an in-depth review of "present organizational arrangements in the United Nations system to deal with emergencies and to make recommendations to (the Secretary General), with particular emphasis on the capacity of the system to respond to complex emergencies." The report was submitted to the 42nd General Assembly together with the Secretary General's report (A/42/657) on the implementation of resolution 41/201.

Disaster relief was not on the regular agenda of the 42nd General Assembly, and there was insufficient time to discuss the reports in detail. Hence, in a decision (A/C/2/42/L.82) approved by consensus, the General Assembly requested that the ECOSOC consider the Secretary General's report in depth at its second regular session in 1988. The General Assembly also called upon the Secretary General to "proceed with the implementation of the conclusions and recommendations" of his report, and take into account the views already expressed by members of the General Assembly.

The Secretary General recommended in his report that UNDRO focus its activities on sudden, natural disasters and on relevant preparation and prevention measures. He also called for "improved communications" between UNDRO and UN Headquarters and made two proposals for strengthening the UNDRO-UNDP relationship: (a) a joint UNDP/UNDRO task force to look at ways of strengthening cooperation, and (b) closer interaction between UNDRO Headquarters in Geneva and the UN resident coordinators in the field. Finally, the Secretary General urged UNDRO itself to utilize more fully the expertise available in the UN system by means of staff secondment or exchanges with a view to improving UNDRO's performance in the field at the site of disasters.

While not as far-reaching as the U.S. reform proposals, the recommendations of the Secretary General—which offer a plan for strengthening UNDRO's performance and its relationship with the UNDP—appear to be consistent with those of the United States The United States will, however, undertake a thorough examination of the Secretary General's proposals in preparation for the in-depth discussion of these issues in 1988.

## UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)

The Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), organized in 1951, is mandated to provide legal protection and material assistance to refugees and to promote permanent solutions for refugee problems. These responsibilities are carried out on behalf of refugees falling within the scope of the Statute of the Office adopted by the General Assembly in 1950. In general, the Statute applies to those persons who are outside their country of nationality because they have a well-founded fear of persecution by reason of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion and, because of such fear, are unable or unwilling to avail themselves of the protection of the government of that country. The term of the current High Commissioner, Jean-Pierre Hocke (Switzerland), expires December 31, 1988.

The Executive Committee of the UNHCR meets annually in Geneva to review the work of the UNHCR and approve the budget. At this meeting, the UNHCR advises the Executive Committee on any special activities. The U.S. Representative at the 38th session of the Executive Committee, held October 5-12, 1987, was Mr. Jonathan Moore, U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs and Ambassador-at-Large.

## INTERNATIONAL LEGAL PROTECTION

The basic legal mechanisms for the protection of refugees are the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, which is restricted to persons who became refugees as a result of events occurring before 1951, and the 1967 Protocol, which removes the time limit on eligibility. The United States is a party to the Protocol. States acceding to these international instruments accept provisions explicitly prohibiting the return of a refugee, in any manner whatsoever, to any country in which his life or freedom would be threatened because of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion. At the same time, however, the refugee has obligations to the country in which he finds himself and is required to conform to its laws and regulations as well as to the measures taken for the maintenance of public order.

The international protection of refugees includes ensuring that they are granted (political) asylum, that those who wish to return voluntarily to their country of origin may do so without penalty for having fled, and that no refugee is forcibly returned to his/her country of origin. The UNHCR also is concerned with providing basic care and maintenance for refugees, including meeting emergency needs, and with protecting the refugees' right to work, to practice their religion, and to receive social benefits under the law.

## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The UN High Commissioner for Refugees, Jean-Pierre Hocke, addressed the Third Committee on November 13. In his statement he said that in certain countries, a combination of factors had given rise to a fear of refugees and a hostility towards them, leading to the adoption of restrictive and unilateral measures which could gradually erode the principle of asylum and international efforts to resolve the problems. In an effort to reverse that trend, he said his office would strive to find durable solutions and to go beyond the provision of emergency assistance in dealing with long-term refugees.

The High Commissioner reported that UNHCR had responded to the needs of 600,000 new refugees in the past 18 months by going beyond the provision of emergency aid and developing income-generating activities which will promote partial self-sufficiency. This approach would meet the needs of both refugees and the host country. He urged all countries to provide aid to host countries so that they would grant asylum to the refugee and implement repatriation, integration, and resettlement policies.

Mr. Hocke's statement highlighted successful repatriation efforts in Africa and Central America and emphasized the potential of voluntary repatriation even after long periods of temporary residence in countries of first asylum. A peaceful settlement of the conflicts in Afghanistan, Kampuchea, and the Horn of Africa would involve the return to their respective countries of 6-7 million refugees. In South East Asia, he believed it was urgent to renew efforts to deal with the causes of continued exodus from Indo-China.

Speaking of UNHCR's concerns, Mr. Hocke said governments should not attempt to settle refugee problems with measures used for immigration control. All measures relating to immigration control should have flexibility to preserve the rights of asylum seekers and refugees seeking protection, as well as their access to those rights.

Fourteen draft resolutions on refugee-related matters were introduced in the Third Committee; ten were related to refugees in Africa, one to refugees in Central America, and three to the Office of the High Commissioner. Nine of the Africa-related resolutions were adopted without a vote: "International Conference on the Plight of Refugees, Returnees and Displaced Persons in Southern Africa" (Resolution 42/106), "Second International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa" (Resolution 42/107), "Humanitarian Assistance to Refugees in Djibouti" (Resolution 42/126), "Assistance to Refugees in Somalia" (Resolution 42/127), "Emergency Assistance to returnees and displaced persons in Chad" (Resolution 42/128), "Situation of Refugees in the Sudan" (Resolution 42/129), and "Assistance to refugees and displaced persons in Malawi" (Resolution 42/132) "Assistance to Student Refugees in Southern Africa" (Resolution 42/138), as was the one on Central America "Assistance to refugees, returnees and displaced persons of Central America." (Resolution 42/110.)

As in the past, the United States—in conjunction with others—again called for rationalization of the African items by combining a multitude of resolutions into one omnibus resolution. With such a move we had hoped to avoid duplication of efforts undertaken at the UNHCR Executive Committee, the Third Committee, and other UN fora.

One of the Africa-related refugee resolutions presented a problem to the United States, namely, the Malawi resolution on the "Conference on the plight of refugees, returnees and displaced persons in Southern Africa." (Resolution 42/106.) Ambiguous language contained in that resolution prompted the United States to make a statement for the record expressing reservations on language that might appear to invite armed revolution.

The three remaining resolutions were: "Continuation of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees" (Resolution 42/108), "Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees" (Resolution 42/109), and "Enlargement of the Executive Committee of the Program of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees." (Resolution 42/130). The United States joined consensus on these three resolutions. Regarding resolution 42/109, however, the United States joined the consensus only with the understanding that operative paragraph 4, insofar as it relates to armed attacks on refugee camps, should be read in light of the conclusions on armed attacks adopted by the Executive Committee of UNHCR in October. These conclusions are endorsed by operative paragraph 5 and are consistent with international law. U.S. support of this resolution was not to be construed as support for the proposition that it is unlawful under any circumstances to use force against a refugee camp or settlement, even if it is being used in a manner inconsistent with its civilian purpose. Resolution 42/130 calling for the enlargement of the UNHCR Executive Committee was also adopted without a vote. The United States joined the consensus with the understanding that the two additional members would be Somalia and Pakistan.

On October 12 Mr. Richard C. Nygard, U. S. Representative to the 5th Committee, made the following statement regarding the UNHCR audit report submitted by the Board of Auditors to the 42nd General Assembly (Item 113, Report of the UN Board of Auditors):

At recent sessions of the General Assembly, the United States delegation has devoted considerable attention in its statement on this agenda item to the audit report on UNHCR. In light of the weaknesses previously identified by the Board of Auditors, my delegation called upon UNHCR management to take the necessary measures to improve budgetary controls, cash management, compliance with procurement procedures, and management of program activities.

The audit report submitted to the current session indicates that UNHCR has made significant progress toward implementing previous recommendations of the Board of Auditors. The High Commissioner has responded to these recommendations by undertaking a number of management reforms. While the audit results show continuing problems in some areas, my delegation notes that these reforms have had a positive effect on UNHCR's programs and operations.

Perhaps the most significant deficiency identified by the auditors was the delivery and distribution of in-kind contributions of food. The auditors have made a number of recommendations to improve the delivery process which UNHCR has agreed to implement. However, it should be noted that many of the problems associated with food aid relate in part to donor and recipient governments.

Annex I of the Advisory Committee's report contains an extract from the special program audit examination of UNHCR programs and operations requested at the 40th General Assembly session. The special program audit recognizes the many improvements which are currently underway and offers recommendations to continue this process.

The High Commissioner is to be commended for the steps he has taken to address the organization's problems and deficiencies and to achieve improvements in both efficiency and effectiveness. The special program audit points to the High Commissioner's efforts to improve financial and management information systems, evaluation, performance monitoring, and procurement systems.

The recommendations made by the auditors focus on further steps to improve the effectiveness of UNHCR's working relationships with implementing partners, to improve administrative efficiency and the effectiveness of field staffing and to enhance the budgeting and planning cycle. The recommendations of the special program audit fit within the overall reform of the organization and we support their early implementation.

## UNHCR PROGRAMS

In 1987 UNHCR estimated total budget requirements for refugee aid throughout the world was $348.9 million. This total included $31.7 million for overall allocations and other small amounts which are not reflected in the expenditures indicated below by geographic region. The United States contributed $105.28 million in support of UNHCR calendar year 1987 assistance programs worldwide.

### Africa

UNHCR programs in Africa totaled $151.3 million in 1987; 125.0 million under General Programs, and $26.3 million under Special Programs. The UNHCR continued the coordination of the major international relief programs in Malawi, Somalia, and Sudan, as well as, the emergency operations benefiting those of concern to the High Commissioner, principally in the Horn of Africa and in Southern Africa. The United States contributed $44.18 million toward programs throughout the region.

### Asia

In 1987 UNHCR requirements to assist refugees in Asia totaled $68.22 million; $58.95 under the General Program and $9.27 under Special Programs. The largest portion of UNHCR expenditures in this region was for the care of Indochinese refugees in Southeast Asian countries of first asylum. The United States contributed $17.56 million toward these UNHCR care and maintenance programs. At the end of 1987, 135,583 refugees occupied UNHCR-supervised camps, compared to 142,290 at the end of 1986 (this number does not include the refugees in Refugee Processing Centers). During 1987, 46,463 Indochinese refugees were resettled abroad, including 27,883 in the United States.

UNHCR continued to pursue other solutions to the Indochinese refugee problem in Southeast Asia, such as voluntary repatriation, when possible, and the Orderly Departure Program (ODP), by which asylum seekers emigrate legally from Vietnam. In the past year, 8,742 Vietnamese used the ODP to rejoin relatives in the United States; and another 4,917 were resettled through the ODP in other countries.

In 1987 the United States contributed $1.18 million in support of the UNHCR and Royal Thai Government cooperative program to combat pirates' attacks on Vietnamese boat refugees in the Gulf of Thailand and for other rescue-at-sea activities.

### Europe and North America

During 1987 UNHCR estimated expenditures for programs to assist refugees in Europe and North America were $15.3 million. UNHCR programs in Europe primarily assist refugees in transit and those refugees who are awaiting repatriation or permanent resettlement. UNHCR assistance activities in North America are primarily related to counseling services on legal and resettlement issues. In 1987 no U.S. funding was provided in support of these programs.

### Latin America

UNHCR estimated expenditures for programs in Latin America in 1987 were $33.7 million, with its largest programs in Honduras, Mexico, and Costa Rica. The United States contributed $10.2 million toward UNHCR assistance programs in this region.

### Southwest Asia, North Africa, and the Middle East

In 1987 UNHCR estimated expenditures for programs in this region totaled $69.9 million. The largest program in the region, the relief effort for over two million Afghans in Pakistan, provides food, shelter, health services, education, and vocational training for the largest refugee population in any country of the world. UNHCR is the lead agency in this major international relief program which supports the Government of Pakistan's efforts to meet the basic needs of these refugees. Since 1984, in conjunction with the World Bank, UNHCR has focused attention on the importance of increasing the Afghans' self-sufficiency as a means of decreasing the burden they pose for the Government of Pakistan and the international community. The World Bank, in conjunction with the UNHCR, has initiated a series of projects designed to provide refugees with employment opportunities, thus freeing them from dependency on camp life in an asylum country. The United States contributed $21.3 million to UNHCR for its Afghan refugee assistance program. A U.S.

contribution of $10 million supported UNHCR programs in Cyprus.

## Social Development

### INTERREGIONAL CONSULTATION ON SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

The United States attended the second UN Interregional Consultation on Developmental Social Welfare Programs and Policies (IRC) held in September 1987 in Vienna. The first IRC was held in 1968. At the meeting, the IRC produced a document, the "Guiding Principles," for adoption by the member nations. After lengthy debate, the United States joined the consensus noting that the document lacked clarity and needed further study.

When the resolution calling for endorsement of the "Guiding Principles" was submitted at the 42nd session of the General Assembly, the United States joined the consensus but made a statement for the record clarifying its understanding that the document stressed the diversity of ways for nations to provide adequate social services for their citizens. The resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 42/125.)

### AGING AND ELDERLY

At the 42nd session of the General Assembly, the United States cosponsored a resolution entitled "Question of Aging." (Resolution 42/51). It was adopted by consensus. The resolution emphasized that the elderly must be considered an important and necessary element in the development process at all levels within a given society. It urged governments to strengthen their efforts, within the context of their own national priorities, to implement the recommendation of the International Plan of Action on Aging.

At the 41st session of the General Assembly, the United States proposed to merge two trust funds for aging into one and move its administrative functions from the UN office in Vienna (UNOV) to UNDP. This proposal led to considerable friction with the Western Europeans and some other delegations, and the United States agreed to defer discussions on the issue until the 42nd General Assembly. At the 42nd session, however, the United States decided not to press the issue, because the reorganization plan of the new Director General of UNOV indicated a positive approach to efficient management of trust funds.

### DISABLED

The United States supports UN programs for the disabled and traditionally cosponsors a resolution on the disabled adopted by the General Assembly. At the 42nd Session of the General Assembly, the United States once again played a lead rolé in having a balanced and noncontentious resolution adopted. (Resolution 42/58.)

At the 41st session of the General Assembly, the United States proposed to place the UN trust funds for the disabled and the aging under the administration of the UN Development Program (UNDP) where such programs could be within the mainstream of UN development activities. The U.S. proposal was not accepted, however. Although the United States still believes that alternative administrative arrangements for trust funds supporting the UN programs in the social field are warranted, the United States did not raise the issue in 1987 in the interest of achieving a consensus on its resolution, and because the new Director General of UNOV indicated a positive approach to improving the administration of the funds.

### YOUTH

At the 42nd session of the General Assembly, the Third Committee debated youth-related issues ranging from channels of communication to make-work projects. Four resolutions on youth were introduced, and three (Resolutions 42/53, 42/54 and 42/55) were adopted by consensus. The United States joined the consensus, but emphasized, in a public statement, the importance of free market principles and the role of nongovernmental organizations in providing opportunities for young people. The fourth resolution (42/52), calling for the enjoyment by youth of the right to work, was adopted by a vote of 131 to 1 (U.S.), with no abstentions. The U.S. Delegation voted no, because the United States opposes the creation of new socio-economic rights without the basic affirmation of political and civil rights.

## SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, AND RESEARCH

### UN Environment Program (UNEP)

The UN Environment Program (UNEP) was established in January 1973 pursuant to UN General Assembly resolution 2997, implementing recommendations of the UN Conference on the Human Environment (Stockholm, June 1972). UNEP stems from a U.S. initiative, and the United States has been an active participant in the program since its inception. UNEP's broad mandate is to catalyze and coordinate environmental activities throughout the UN system and to support efforts by national governments worldwide to deal with environmental and natural resource problems of common interest.

UNEP headquarters is located in Nairobi, Kenya, with regional offices in Bangkok, Geneva, Mexico City, Manama, and Washington, D.C., and a liaison office in New York. UNEP also maintains the office for the International Registry for Potential Toxic Chemicals in Geneva and the Industry and Environment Office in Paris.

Dr. Mostafa Tolba (Egypt), the Executive Director since 1976 and currently in his third 4-year term, heads the UNEP Secretariat. UNEP's program and policy oversight body is the Governing Council [GC]. It consists of 58 member countries, elected by the General Assembly to 3-year terms and apportioned regionally (16 seats for African States, 13 Asian, 6 Eastern European, 10 Latin American, and 13 Western European and others). The Governing Council reports to the Assembly through the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC). The Governing Council convenes biennially. The 14th regular session was held in Nairobi, June 8-19, 1987. The next regular session is scheduled for June 1989. A special meeting of the Governing Council will be held March 14-18, 1988, to approve the UN Systems Wide Medium-term Environmental Program (SWMTEP).

While a core staff in UNEP's Secretariat is funded by assessed contributions from the general UN budget, UNEP's activities are funded primarily by voluntary contributions from governments to the Environment Fund. The United States is the largest contributor to the Environment Fund, providing approximately 30 percent or $7.84 million of the total contributions for CY-1988. The total budget for UNEP for CY 1988 is $40 million.

The UNEP programs of greatest importance to the United States are those concerned with environmental law, the atmosphere, global monitoring (Earthwatch), oceans, ecosystems management (including resource management and deforestation), and environmental management (including environmental impact assessment). UNEP has played a key role in the negotiation of two major international agreements on the environment, the Vienna Convention on the Protection of the Ozone Layer and its protocol on substances that deplete the ozone layer, The Montreal Protocol, which the United States ratified in 1986 and 1988, respectively. UNEP is also actively involved in the issues of biological diversity and the international transport of hazardous waste. UNEP has also played a major role in activity on the issue of the global climate change (the effects of greenhouse gases). In cooperation with the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), it is currently studying the scientific and social impacts on climate change and identifying possible responses for presentation to the Governing Council.

## THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

The 14th regular session of the Governing Council of UNEP (GC-14) was held June 8-19 in Nairobi, Kenya. It was attended by delegations from all 58 member states in addition to 45 nonmember states, 2 liberation movements, 12 UN organs, other intergovernmental organizations, 9 specialized agencies, and 25 nongovernmental organizations (NGOs).

In general, U.S. initiatives and proposals received broad-based support at the GC-14. However, significant differences arose on the issues of hazardous wastes and the global climate change.

In connection with the move to biennial sessions, the Governing Council also decided that the Committee of Permanent Representatives would continue to meet quarterly with the Executive Director. The Committee of Permanent Representatives is a consultative group composed of Permanent Representatives resident in Nairobi established to maintain a dialogue with the Executive Director between Governing Council sessions and to take action on matters specifically entrusted to it by the Council.

On financial and budgetary matters, the Governing Council welcomed the pledges of Norway, Finland, France, Japan, and Switzerland to increase substantially their contribution to the Environment Fund. The United Kingdom increased its contribution in 1986.

Among substantive issues, the issue of the prior informed consent (PIC) in connection with the international trade of banned and severely restricted chemicals was one of the most contentious issues of the GC-14. Some African, Asian, and Latin American states proposed a draft resolution which would include the concept of PIC as part of the London Guidelines. Negotiation, with the U.S. Delegation playing an active role, resulted in a resolution which adopted the London Guidelines without the inclusion of the concept of PIC. In this resolution, the Executive Director is instructed to convene a meeting of experts to examine possibilities regarding PIC and other possible methods for effecting safe management of hazardous wastes.

Following up on the proposal made by the U.S. Delegation in its opening statement, the Governing Council approved a decision calling for the establishment of a working group of experts to examine the feasibility of an umbrella international convention on biological diversity. The purpose of such a convention would be to improve international coordination, identification of priorities, and reduction of duplication throughout the field of species and habitat protection.

The United States proposed a resolution calling for an intergovernmental panel to assess of global climate change. This panel would bring to bear the broadest possible expertise and perspectives on greenhouse gas emissions and their possible impacts, with participation open to all UNEP and World Meteorological Organization (WMO) members. The United States, the U.S.S.R., France, and the United Kingdom objected to a proposal for UNEP-sponsored work on a global climate convention. As a compromise, the final resolution called for the intergovernmental panel but also for a report in 1989 by the Executive Director laying out the full range of possible responses by governments and international organizations to the anticipated climate change, including possibilities of reducing the rate of change.

On the issue of an environmental impact assessment (EIA), U.S. efforts to get the GC-14 to agree to begin work on an international EIA convention failed in the face of broad and substantial opposition. The U.S. Delegation did manage to include in the text of the resolution on the subject a call for follow-up work by the Executive Director to investigate additional measures for furthering international cooperation and agreement on environmental impact assessment.

With regard to environmental measurement, the Governing Council adopted a decision to have UNEP convene a one-time meeting of experts to consider the best means to achieve progress in the improvement and harmonization of environmental measurement.

The U.S. Delegation was successful in broadening an initial draft on technology transfer to include a call for governments to promote commercial exchange and, along with international intergovernmental trade organizations, to review terms of trade relating to such technology and to share results of public research and demonstration of nonproprietary control technology.

The U.S. Delegation raised detailed objections to Executive Director's proposal for UNEP to enter into activities which are the primary responsibility of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

The major portion of the 14th session was devoted to consideration of two major documents dealing with global environmental issues. Both documents grew out of the sharply increased focus of the 42nd General Assembly on the situation of the global environment and the need for definite and immediate action.

The first of these documents was The Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) titled *Our Common Future*. The WCED Report was the result of a comprehensive 3-year study of the global environment outlook by a commission chaired by Norwegian Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland. The Commission, established by a UN General Assembly resolution in 1983, was independent and composed of members serving in their personal capacity, not as representatives of governments. Former Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), William D. Ruckleshaus, was a member of the Commission. The central aim of the Commission was to develop strategies for promoting environmentally sustainable development to the Year 2000 and beyond. Conclusions and recommendations of the Commissioners are contained in the WCED report.

Following careful study, the Governing Council agreed to accept the Commission's report as "a guideline to be taken into account in further work of the United Nations Environment Program." It was also agreed to transmit the document to the UN General Assembly.

Efforts to reach agreement on the second of these documents, "The Environmental Perspective," were difficult and protracted. The Environmental Perspective was prepared by the Intergovernmental Inter-sessional Preparatory Committee (IIPC) of the UNEP Governing Council in response to by General Assembly resolution 38/161 (1983). Unlike the independent WCED Commission, the IIPC was an official intergovernmental body designated to review and evaluate the global environmental situation now, into the Year 2000, and beyond. The Environmental Perspective, which was directly and indirectly linked to the work of the World Commission, drew many of the same conclusions as the WCED report. While the United States was able to agree with many of the basic premises and findings of the "Environmental Perspective," the United States and other delegations objected to some of the conclusions of the report. After intense and lengthy negotiation, the Governing Council, including the United States, agreed to adopt the Environmental Perspective while specifically acknowledging that different views existed on some aspects of it. Several delegations submitted for the record statements emphasizing the point that joining consensus on this document did not mean acceptance of all elements of the document. The United States also issued a statement to this effect during the plenary session.

The Governing Council also adopted a decision calling for a one-time meeting of experts on the improvement and harmonization of environmental measurement, as well as the establishment of an *Ad Hoc* working group to consider the desirability and possible form of a convention on biological diversity.

Consideration was also given to the issues of the transfer of technology, the environmental impact of Apartheid, and the occupied territories. It was decided to limit UNEP activity in the area of nuclear accidents, noting that this is primarily the area of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

## THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL

The 14th session of the Governing Council confirmed the plan to hold a diplomatic conference on the protection of the ozone layer. Following several years of negotiations under the auspices of UNEP, the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer was adopted in March 1985. Sixteen nations have ratified the Vienna Convention which will enter into force upon ratification by 20 nations -- or by another 4 more. Although in itself a noteworthy achievement, this agreement contained no concrete measures to control ozone depleting chemicals. In 1986 UNEP held several meetings to discuss this issue. The decision by the Governing Council at the 13th session to pursue an international convention which would address this problem led to a series of negotiating sessions culminating in a diplomatic conference in September 1987 in Montreal, Canada. On September 16 the United States and 23 other nations signed the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer. Upon ratification by 11 nations representing at least two-thirds of the global consumption of the depleting substances, the Protocol will enter into force. The Montreal Protocol is a significant step toward protection of a vital global resource.

## UNEP ISSUES AT THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

As is mandated by its charter, the Governing Council of UNEP referred several environmental issues to the 42nd UN General Assembly. These issues were given lengthy and in-depth consideration and resolutions were adopted on a number of issues, including Protection of the Ozone Layer, Traffic in Toxic Waste, and international cooperation in the field of the environment. Resolution 42/186 (adopted without a vote) accepted the UNEP Environmental Perspective as a broad framework to guide national action and international cooperation on policies and programs aimed at achieving environmentally sound development. The governing bodies of the organizations of the UN system were called upon to consider the Environmental Perspective and take it into account in the development of their own medium-term plans and programs whenever relevant to their own mandates. A resolution was also adopted without a vote welcoming the report of the WCED and calling upon the bodies, organizations, and programs of the United Nations to review their policies, programs, budgets, and activities to ensure that they support the concept of sustainable development. (Resolution 42/187.) The General Assembly decided to transmit the WCED Report to Governments and UN agencies with an invitation for them to take account of its analysis and recommendations in determining their policies and programs.

## UN Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation

The United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation (UNSCEAR)* was established by the General Assembly in 1955 to provide continuous review and evaluation of the effects of ionizing radiation on humans and their environment. Radiation in this context covers both natural and man-made (i.e., from atmospheric and surface nuclear-weapons tests, nuclear power plants, and peaceful nuclear explosions), environmental radiation, and medical and occupational exposures.

Under its terms of reference, the Committee receives, assembles, and compiles reports and information furnished by its member states, members of the United Nations, specialized agencies, the IAEA, and nongovernmental organizations on observed levels of ionizing radiation and on scientific observations and experiments relevant to the effects of ionizing radiation on man and his environment.

Since its establishment, the Committee has prepared and submitted to the UN General Assembly six comprehensive reports on the effects of ionizing radiation. In addition to collation and evaluation of the literature on radiation effects, UNSCEAR agreed in 1973 to evaluate the radiological hazards created by the testing activities of one country, if asked to do so by a neighboring country which was potentially at risk. To date, no such evaluations have been requested. The recent accident at the Chernobyl nuclear reactor in the U.S.S.R. has resulted in preparation of a preliminary document entitled "Assessment of the Long Term Impact of the Chernobyl Accident." This will be completed at the next (37th) session of UNSCEAR.

---

*The member states are Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, France, Federal Republic of Germany, India, Indonesia, Japan, Mexico, Peoples Republic of China, Peru, Poland, Sudan, Sweden, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, and the United States.

The 36th session of UNSCEAR met in Vienna from March 23-27. The U.S. Representative was Fred A. Mettler, Jr., M.D., Professor and Chairman of Radiology at the University of New Mexico. The session was concerned with continuing consideration of chapters for monographic reports to the General Assembly on the effects of ionizing radiation in the following fields:

— doses from natural sources of radiation
— the exposure, both general and occupational, arising from the nuclear fuel cycle
— doses from the medical uses of radiation
— a sensitivity analysis of weighted doses
— the early effects of high doses of radiation on man
— specialized topics relating to the genetic effects of irradiation
— radiation-induced tumors in man, with a reevaluation of the risk factors
— assessment of the long term impact of Chernobyl.

The Committee is in the process of developing reports, with scientific annexes, on the specialized topics mentioned. In 1986 the Committee published a comprehensive report, "Genetic and Somatic Effects of Ionizing Radiation," limited in scope to the following subjects:

— genetic effects of radiation
— dose-response relationships for radiation induced cancer
— biological effects of pre-natal irradiation

## New and Renewable Sources of Energy (NRSE)

The UN Committee on the Development and Utilization of New and Renewable Sources of Energy met in New York from June 9-13, 1986. This was the third session of the committee since adoption of the UN Program of Action for New and Renewable Sources of Energy in Nairobi in 1981. An Interim Committee met in Rome in 1982 and discussed the role of the UN system in this field. Three meetings of the NRSE committee have made little progress in mobilizing development efforts in this area.

Although we have a substantial interest in the development of new and renewable energy sources, the United States does not view the United Nations as having a central directive role to play. We prefer to emphasize the importance of bilateral assistance and the private sector. In order to limit the expansion of the UN bureaucracy in this field, the United States opposed the establishment of permanent institutional arrangements for implementing the Nairobi Plan of Action from the outset. A U.S. proposal that followup functions be carried out by the already-existing Committee on Natural Resources was rejected by other delegations.

At the third session, the United States questioned the disjointed nature of the UN effort (e.g., 17 different agencies have NRSE projects), the size of the UN bureaucracy administering these programs, and the lack of achievement which the United Nations can claim in this area. Our delegate requested the Committee to review its results and suggested that the lack of progress indicated that the Committee could be eliminated. Although a number of delegations supported this suggestion, the Group of 77 opposed the suggestion and no progress was made at this session on the eventual elimination of this useless body.

The next session of the Committee is scheduled for March of 1988. No significant action took place in this area in 1987.

## Science and Technology for Development

In 1979 the General Assembly created three bodies to deal with science and technology for development: (1) the Intergovernmental Committee for Science and Technology for Development (IGCSTD) to formulate policy guidelines and identify priorities and activities in this area, which would be open for participation by all UN members; (2) the Center for Science and Technology for Development to coordinate science and technology activities within the United Nations at the Secretariat level and to serve the Intergovernmental Committee; and (3) the voluntarily-funded Interim Fund for Science and Technology for Development, which the UN Development Program (UNDP) would administer until the end of 1981. The General Assembly gave the Interim Fund permanent status in 1982 as the UN Financing System for Science and Technology for Development.

In 1982 the General Assembly adopted a resolution designed to keep open the institutional debate on science and technology for development. Although the resolution established long-term financial and institutional arrangements, it left open the difficult questions of the proposed financing plan and the voting arrangements for its Executive Board. These were further negotiated at two sessions of the IGCSTD in 1983. Since attendees could not reach agreement, the Secretary General was asked to undertake consultations with governments on the money issues again and, if he were satisfied that there was sufficient interest, to call a pledging conference. There was insufficient interest among governments, and the Secretary General did not convene the conference.

Each year thereafter, the same issues arose. Member nations expressed insufficient interest, and voluntary contributions sufficient to support proposed activities failed to materialize.

In 1985 the Secretary General and the UN Financing System for Science and Technology for Development again prepared operating proposals. The proposed system would be closely linked to the operations of the UNDP and would provide for a modest staff. While the United States did not oppose science and technology activity carried out through a separate UN organization, we continued to oppose the establishment of "multilaterally-pooled funds" for this purpose. The United States recommended that the United Nations limit its activities to playing a broker role, bringing together potential projects in developing countries with sources of financing and technology in the developed world, including the private sector.

In the face of declining interest on the part of member governments, either in reaching agreement on the structure and financing of the Financing System, the UN Director General for Development and International Economic Cooperation prepared recommendations for the Intergovernmental Committee providing for termination of the Financing System and the transfer of its activities and residual resources to a trust fund under UNDP management. (In effect, this proposal would recognize the practical arrangements which had been in place since 1980.)

The Intergovernmental Committee, at its session, June 2-6, approved the proposals of the Director General. Upon receiving the recommendations of the Intergovernmental Committee, the UNDP Governing Council in late June, by a unanimous decision:

1) established a trust fund for science and technology for development with effect from January 1, 1987; 2) stipulated that the administrative costs of this new facility would be borne by the fund itself; 3) invited governments which would have contributed to the Financing System to transfer such pledges to the trust fund; 4) urged all governments and the international community as a whole to provide resources to the new fund; and 5) requested the Administrator of UNDP to report to the Council in 1987 on the organizational structure, staffing, and budget of the new facility.

Acting upon the decision of the Governing Council, the UN General Assembly, in resolution 41/183, decided to terminate the UN Financing System for Science and Technology for Development and to transfer its responsibilities and resources to a facility within UNDP entitled "The UN Fund for Science and Technology for Development" (UNFSTD). The Administrator of UNDP, to achieve better coherence in operational and administrative terms, decided to merge the UNDP Energy Office with that of UNFSTD. Each element in this combined office will maintain its separate funding mechanism.

The ninth session of the United Nations Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development (IGC) met at UN headquarters in New York City July 27 through August 7. The agenda for this biennial meeting included substantive discussion of two issues: the application of science and technology to the study, prevention, monitoring, and combatting of drought, desertification, and other natural disasters; and the impact of new and emerging areas of science and technology on the economic growth of developing countries. The Committee also discussed the 1988-1989 work program of the UN Center for Science and Technology for Development and provided substantive guidance to improve its operations.

In light of the decision on the Financing System, the United States urged the IGC to take a critical look at its organization of work and to focus its attention on a selected number of issues where it could achieve practical results. For example, the United States proposed the elimination of several agenda items and that the IGC concentrate on one, rather than two, substantive themes at future meetings. We also suggested that more work could be done in understanding better the role of science and technology in economic growth in developing countries. Another suggestion dealt with the examination of government policies which stimulate the development of new technologies and encourage private initiative.

The IGC devoted considerable effort to preparing a set of recommendations for the Special Commission of the Economic and Social Council on the reform of the economic and social sectors of the United Nations. Included in its recommendations to the Center were: promotion of technical innovation in developing countries, strengthening endogenous capacities, formulation of strategies for the advancement of women in the area of science and technology, and harmonization of policies on science and technology within the UN system. Recognizing the inherent change in its status effected by the long debate on a financing system, the IGC dropped from its agenda financing of science and technology activity and the issue of an accompanying bureaucratic mechanism as envisioned by the Vienna Conference. The Committee decided upon a more limited and better focused agenda with more attention to substantive themes. It acknowledged the need to concentrate on its role in policy development and coordination. The IGC advised the Center, in turn, to curtail any fund-raising activities as well as detailed operational activities. The IGC will henceforth develop guidance on policy and priorities for use by the UN Fund for Science and Technology now operating under UNDP aegis.

## UN University

The United States, as a government, played no role in the UN University during 1987. It has not made a contribution to the UN University trust fund. It is, nonetheless, generally supportive of its activities.

## University for Peace

The United States joined the UN consensus decision (1980) which created the University of Peace. Nonetheless, the United States has reservations about the capacity of the University for Peace to acquire the funding base and academic infrastructure necessary to make a sustained academic contribution to high-level analysis of peace issues. As a government, the United States played no role in the University for Peace during 1987.

## UN Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR)

### STRUCTURE AND FUNCTIONS

The UN General Assembly established the UN Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) in 1965 as the result of U.S. initiatives embodied in Assembly resolutions in 1962 and 1963. UNITAR is an autonomous UN institution intended to enhance the effectiveness of the structure and functioning of the UN system by means of training of delegates to the United Nations in the operations of the UN system, its governing bodies and the issues it addresses, as well as research. Since January 1983, Dr. Michel Doo Kingue (Cameroon) has been the Executive Director of UNITAR.

The Secretary General, after consultation with the Presidents of the General Assembly and the ECOSOC, appoints members of the Board of Trustees, who serve for 3-year terms. In addition to appointed members, four persons are *ex-officio* Board members: the UN Secretary General, the President of the General Assembly, the President of ECOSOC, and the Executive Director of UNITAR. In 1987 the Board of Trustees consisted of 20 appointed members, who serve in their personal capacity and not as formal representatives of governments. Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations Alan L. Keyes represented the United States on the Board of Trustees. His term expired on December 31, 1987.

### BACKGROUND

The General Assembly directed UNITAR to be wholly dependent upon voluntary contributions. In 1980 and 1981, however, the General Assembly began giving UNITAR financial assistance, and in those years made up UNITAR's budget deficits with "grants-in-aid." In 1983 UNITAR again had a deficit in its budget, and over the strong objections of the United States, the 38th General Assembly awarded UNITAR an advance of up to $886,000 on a "non-recurrent, reimbursable basis," to be repaid in installments of about $100,000 annually beginning in 1986. UNITAR's financial problems continued, and a resolution (39/177) passed by the 39th General Assembly in 1984 granted UNITAR $1.5 million, on an exceptional basis, to supplement funds raised through voluntary contributions for the General Fund.

In response to this action, the United States reduced its 1985 pledge to UNITAR by an amount equivalent to the U.S. proportionate share of the General Assembly grant, or $375,000. As a result of the inability of UNITAR and the General Assembly to resolve UNITAR's long-term financial problems in 1985 within UNITAR's mandate, the United States has not pledged to UNITAR since 1986. That was the year in which the United States publicly announced the view—which it continues to hold—that UNITAR's functions do not justify its continuation as a separate institution and recommended that UNITAR be closed and its training function be placed elsewhere within the UN system.

The 41st General Assembly adopted by consensus a resolution (41/172) calling for a restructuring of the Institute over a 3-year period (1987-1989). The resolution also requested the Secretary General to take steps to close UNITAR in 1987 should sufficient funding not be forthcoming.

## UNITAR in 1987

The UNITAR Board of Trustees held its 25th session at UN Headquarters in New York from March 30 to April 3, under the chairmanship of the Pakistan Permanent Representative to the United Nations, Mr. S. Shah Nawaz. The main items discussed were: (l) UNITAR's financial situation and whether the Institute should continue operations; (2) the program and budget for 1987; (3) the future use or disposition of the UNITAR premises in New York; and (4) the critical situation facing UNITAR staff.

Addressing the opening session of the Board of Trustees, the UN Secretary General discussed UNITAR's progress to date in implementing the restructuring plan contained in UN resolution 41/172, and UNITAR's serious financial situation. In his remarks to the Board, the Secretary General stressed that "time is running out" for UNITAR and that he would have no other option than to start closing UNITAR if the minimum level of financial resources needed were not available by mid-June 1987. Consequently, the Board approved a 1987 budget of $1.6 million on condition that the UNITAR Executive Director reduce expenditures accordingly if sufficient resources were not received to meet this budget, or the Secretary General should proceed to close down UNITAR and report to the 42nd UN General Assembly pursuant to resolution 41/172.

In mid-April the Secretary General convened a meeting of UNITAR's traditional donors to inform them: (a) of the progress made in restructuring the Institute since the adoption of resolution 41/172, (b) of the conclusions reached at the recent session of the Board of Trustees, and (c) of the need to seek confirmation from governments concerning unpaid 1987 pledges to UNITAR. He noted at that meeting that the 1987 budget gap was about $500,000—one-third of UNITAR's total budget. He also reconfirmed his intention to begin phasing out UNITAR in June. The meeting failed to produce additional financial support for UNITAR.

On the eve of the 42nd General Assembly's consideration of UNITAR, the Institute's Executive Director called a special, 2-day session (October 26-27) of the Board of Trustees to discuss a cooperation agreement he had recently signed with a private Hong-Kong based business group, as well as other possibilities for mobilizing additional resources. At that session, the Board also agreed that UNITAR's financial constraints necessitated the sale of the UNITAR property.

While no decision was reached on the propriety or legality of the cooperation agreement—which could have provided UNITAR up to an additional $10 million over a 3-year period—it was subsequently abrogated when the UN Legal Counsel proposed certain legal amendments which were unacceptable to the business group.

In accordance with the requirements of UN resolution 41/172, the Secretary General prepared a report on the progress of UNITAR's restructuring plan for consideration by the 42nd General Assembly (A/42/694). The report's two most significant recommendations were: (1) to continue UNITAR's operations "on a trial basis," and (2) to sell the UNITAR property as quickly as possible in order to repay the Institute's debt to the United Nations and to establish a reserve fund for UNITAR with the balance of funds from the sale of the property.

At the opening of the general debate on UNITAR, the United States stated its position:

> The Secretary General's report presents a very clear picture of the severe financial difficulties UNITAR is experiencing. He has reported that UNITAR had an accumulated cash deficit at the beginning of 1987 of almost $1.5 million. In 1987 the Institute incurred an additional budget deficit of $686,000. UNITAR's cash deficits have been financed for the most part by borrowing funds from the United Nations, to which it will owe an estimated $1,950,000 as at the end of 1987. Almost two-thirds of that amount—about $1,264,000—will be due and payable at that time.
>
> The Secretary General also states in his report that the United Nations itself is facing severe financial constraints and thus is not in a position to assist UNITAR financially. The Secretary General further states that voluntary contributions have not been forthcoming in 1987 from governments to enable UNITAR to meet its operating expenses.
>
> All these factors regrettably but clearly indicate that UNITAR can no longer cope with its financial obligations, and that appropriate steps should be taken to close the Institute, in accordance with the General Assembly's instructions to the Secretary General as contained in resolution 41/172.
>
> The United States is willing to consider the possibility of reassigning UNITAR's training function—which many delegations believe has merit—to other existing UN bodies. Perhaps the training function could be placed within an existing unit of the UNSecretariat . . . Whatever mechanism the General Assembly may choose to preserve the training function, in our view, it is essential that this activity be on a financially sound basis, operating strictly within existing resources. If the training function fails to attract enough voluntary contributions, as is the present case with UNITAR, then one would be

> forced to recommend its termination as well. Hard choices will have to be made in this period of austerity, but there is, no acceptable alternative.
>
> The United States concurs with the Secretary General's recommendation that the entire UNITAR property be sold, and a part of the resources obtained be used to repay the Institute's debt to the United Nations. The cash balance remaining could be used to help fund training activities during future years.

The General Assembly's Second Committee (economic and social issues), after a long, detailed debate, adopted without a vote onDecember 11, a revised draft resolution which calls upon the Secretary General to restructure UNITAR commensurate with the Institute's limited financial resources (Resolution 42/197). The net result of the decision is a scaled-down UNITAR whose major focus will be training. UNITAR's ongoing research activities are "to be concluded as soon as possible." The resolution also approved the Secretary General's recommendations regarding the sale of the UNITAR property and repayment of the Institute's debt to the United Nations. The Secretary General is required to prepare a report for the 43rd session of the General Assembly on the implementation of the resolution and on "any developments that may affect the future of the Institute."

The United States did not oppose this consensus, since the measures called for in the resolution are basically consistent with U.S. views and ultimate objective; i.e., the phasing out of UNITAR. At the end of the debate, however, the United States expressed its preference for the earlier version of the draft resolution—which contained a recommendation for downgrading the grade level of the UNITAR Executive Director—and it urged the Secretary General to "take the necessary action to continue the restructuring and reexamination of the grading levels required by UNITAR."

## HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS

The principal human rights organ of the United Nations, the Commission on Human Rights (UNHRC), held its 43rd annual session February 2 to March 13. The U.S. delegation was headed by E. Robert Wallach, the U.S. Representative to the Commission. ECOSOC subsequently considered the Commission's report at its First Regular Session in New York from May 4–29. Finally, the General Assembly's 42nd session, held from September 15 to December 21, considered a lengthy agenda of human rights issues. The 39th session of the Commission's expert Subcommission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities was held from August 10 to September 4.

### Situation of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms in Cuba

The United States undertook a major initiative in the United Nations in 1987 when it introduced at the Commission a resolution calling upon the

UNHRC to include the human rights situation in Cuba on the agenda of its 44th session. This was the first time the UNHRC had formally considered the human rights situation in Cuba and, despite initial fears that it would not be possible to confront Cuba in the United Nations, it was a victory for defenders of human rights. In its first operative paragraph the resolution expressed deep concern over the specific and detailed allegations of serious human rights violations in Cuba, in particular those related to the right to freedom of expression, the right to freedom of association, the right to freedom of liberty and security of person, and freedom from arbitrary arrest or detention, the right to a fair trial, the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion, and the right of individuals to leave their country and to return to it.

The United States intended to bring the human rights situation in Cuba to the attention of the general public as well as the Commission. To this end, internationally known human rights activist and poet Armando Valladares was named alternate head of the U.S. delegation. Valladares was uniquely qualified to speak about the human rights situation in Cuba having been imprisoned there for 22 years because he expressed his concerns about the direction in which Castro was leading the country. His 1986 book, *Against All Hope,* was instrumental in bringing to world attention the horrors of life in Cuba's prisons.

In an innovative move, the United States brought 17 former political prisoners to speak informally to Commission members. This was the first time a delegation presented to the Commission dramatic "living proof" to substantiate allegations of human rights violations in a country. Other delegates to the Commission were visibly moved by the witnesses' testimony. Within the U.S. Government, the Executive and Legislative branches cooperated at the highest levels to promote passage of the resolution in the UNHRC. Members of Congress and their staffs from both parties lobbied extensively at the Commission, demonstrating the commitment of the U.S. Government to improving the human rights situation in Cuba. The U.S. Information Agency complemented these efforts by facilitating strong media coverage throughout the world of human rights abuses in Cuba. These concerted efforts made it extraordinarily difficult to ignore the reality of life in Cuba.

In a particularly disappointing move, the Indian delegation introduced a procedural motion to defer consideration of the U.S. resolution. The procedural motion passed by one vote—19 to 18 (U.S.), with 6 abstentions. (Decision 1987/105). Had the substantive resolution itself come to a vote, it was generally believed that it would have been successful.

In the wake of the procedural motion, several Latin American governments faced widespread domestic criticism of their support of the Indian motion in the face of the compelling evidence presented by the United States. In addition, several Congressional resolutions were passed expressing dismay at the results at the Commission and calling for increased linkage between a country's voting record in the United Nations and the level of bilateral assistance provided by the United States. These expressions of Congressional concern were helpful to the continuing efforts by the United States to win passage of a resolution in the United Nations recognizing the human rights situation in Cuba. General Vernon Walters, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, promised that the United States would continue to raise the human rights situation in Cuba at all appropriate UN fora.

## Elimination of All Forms of Religious Intolerance

The right to freedom of religion has been a longstanding U.S. concern within the Human Rights Commission. The United States introduced a resolution during the 43rd session of the UNHRC calling for an extension of 1 year of the mandate of the Special Rapporteur on religious intolerance. The adoption without a vote of this resolution entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Elimination of all Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief" (Resolution 1987/15) marked a victory for Western interests in the Commission.

This victory was confirmed by the First Regular Session of ECOSOC, which adopted by consensus a decision approving the Commission's decision to extend for 1 year the mandate of the Special Rapporteur to examine government actions in all parts of the world which are inconsistent with past UN declarations concerning religious tolerance. (Decision 1987/143.)

At the 42nd UN General Assembly, the subject of the elimination of all forms of religious intolerance was again discussed as a major human rights issue. U.S. Ambassador Byrne delivered a strong statement deploring religious persecution in the Soviet Union and Communist bloc countries. Ireland introduced a draft resolution which reaffirmed the principles of the 1981 Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination Based on Religion or Belief and called for an end to religious intolerance. This Irish resolution was adopted by consensus. (Resolution 42/97.)

## Human Rights in the Occupied Territories of the Middle East

Following the pattern set since 1968, the Commission on Human Rights once again debated the agenda item entitled "Question of the Violation of Human Rights in the Occupied Arab Territories, Including Palestine" at the outset of the 43rd session. The United States vigorously opposed this annual and fruitless debate for its exaggerated and inaccurate rhetoric condemning Israel. The Sri Lankan delegation put forward a two-part resolution, cosponsored mainly by Arab and Communist countries, which contained the annual string of unsupported condemnations of alleged Israeli policies and practices. Part A of resolution 1987/2 passed by a vote of 28 to 8 (U.S.), with 6 abstentions. Part B focused upon the Geneva Convention relative to the

Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War and contained further allegations of Israeli violations. The draft resolution contained one provision which reaffirmed that the Geneva Convention is applicable to all Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including Jerusalem. In a separate vote on this paragraph, the United States voted in favor but voted against Part B as a whole. This resolution was adopted by a vote of 29 to 1 (U.S.), with 12 abstentions.

A companion resolution, 1987/1, introduced by the representative of Nicaragua and cosponsored by several Arab and Communist countries, dealt with the human rights situation in occupied Syrian territories. This resolution, an almost exact copy of an Indian resolution submitted in 1985, contained numerous objectionable paragraphs, including unsubstantiated allegations against Israel and criticism of the "pro-Israeli position of a Permanent Member of the Security Council," which prevented the Security Council from taking "appropriate measures." This resolution was approved by a vote of 28 to 1 (U.S.), with 13 abstentions.

At the 42nd UN General Assembly, resolutions concerning Israel seemed little more than exercises in propaganda. One resolution (42/160) addressing Israeli practices in the Occupied Territories, was discussed in the Special Political Committee under the agenda item "Report of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories."

## Racial Discrimination in Southern Africa

The subject of racial discrimination, with the focus on Apartheid in South Africa, was prominent on the agendas of both the Commission on Human Rights and the General Assembly. At the 43rd Commission session, racial discrimination and Apartheid were considered under a cluster of four agenda items which regularly appear on the Commission's agendas year after year. In the debate, Ambassador Wallach expressed the revulsion the U.S. Government feels towards Apartheid. He presented a defense of U.S. policies vis-a-vis South Africa and outlined what America was willing to do to end this degrading system. He asked that the U.S. policy of moderation and gradual change be given time to succeed.

An important goal of the U.S. delegation was to achieve agreement on at least one draft resolution under the cluster of agenda items which would have recorded the universal condemnation of the Apartheid system felt by all delegations and thus could have been adopted by consensus. Unfortunately, negotiations with African delegations to this end did not succeed. The resolution concerning the situation of human rights in South Africa, which was based upon the report of the Commission's *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts on South Africa (first established by the Commission in 1967) and which contained general condemnations of Apartheid, also contained a number of other provisions which the U.S. Government could not accept. Therefore, the United States voted against the resolution concerning the situation of human rights in South Africa. The final vote was 36 to 3 (U.S.), with 3 abstentions. (Resolution 1987/14.) Another resolution concerning the situation of human rights in Namibia was adopted by a vote of 35 to 0, with 7 (U.S.) abstentions. The U.S. abstention was predicated on the U.S. role in assisting all concerned parties to arrive at a peaceful, negotiated solution which will facilitate the earliest possible independence for Namibia. (Resolution 1987/8.)

The United States voted against a third resolution, another in a long series of resolutions carrying the title, "The adverse consequences for the enjoyment of human rights of political, military, economic and other forms of assistance given to colonial and racist regimes in southern Africa." The vote was 30 to 6 (U.S.), with 6 abstentions. The United States and others rejected provisions of that resolution which condemned various forms of economic activity carried out by Western corporations in South Africa. (Resolution 1987/9.) At the same meeting, the Commission considered a draft resolution under the same title recommended by the Subcommission for adoption by the Commission, which was adopted by a vote of 31 to 5 (U.S.), with 6 abstentions. (Resolution 1987/10.) The resolution endorsed the work of its Special Rapporteur on "adverse consequences."

Resolution 1987/11 concerning the implementation of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid was approved by a vote of 31 to 1 (U.S.), with 10 abstentions. The United States cast a negative vote because the resolution contained provisions equating Apartheid with genocide and condemned transnational corporations engaged in legal activities.

Finally, a resolution relating to the implementation of the Program of Action for the Second Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1987/12.) The United States did not participate in this vote, following its long held policy of nonparticipation in voting on resolutions relating to the Second Decade. The policy of nonparticipation dates from the adoption by the UN General Assembly in 1975 of a resolution equating racism with Zionism.

At the First Regular Session of ECOSOC, 1987, the situation of human rights in South Africa again figured on the agenda. A decision was adopted by consensus renewing the mandate of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group of Experts on southern Africa. (Decision 1987/142.) The ECOSOC also adopted with a vote of 44 to 2 (U.S.) with 6 abstentions, a resolution condemning transnational corporations operating in South Africa. (Resolution 1987/56.)

At the 42nd UN General Assembly, five resolutions were adopted on items relating to racial discrimination and Apartheid which were considered by the Third Committee. The United States again did not participate in the vote on a resolution relating to the Second Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, which was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 42/47.) The resolution contained a number of operative paragraphs encouraging governments to continue supporting the Decade program and endorsing certain measures under that program. The United States joined consensus on a resolution concerning the torture and inhuman treatment of children in detention in South Africa. (Resolution 42/124.) The United States also joined consensus on a resolution concerning assistance to student refugees in South Africa. (Resolution 42/138.)

Resolution 42/56 concerning the status of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid was approved by a vote of 128 to 1 (U.S.), with 27 abstentions. United States' opposition was due mainly to provisions in the resolution equating Apartheid with genocide and elaborating the idea that transnational corporations operating in South Africa are committing the "crime of apartheid." Finally, a resolution on the report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 42/57.)

## Self-Determination

The right to self-determination retained its place on the agendas of human rights organs in 1987 as one of the most widely discussed of the basic human rights. At its 43rd session, the Human Rights Commission adopted six resolutions under this recurring agenda item. A resolution on the denial of human rights in Afghanistan was put forward by the representative of Pakistan. The resolution, which reaffirmed the Commission's concern for the denial of human rights in Afghanistan and called for the immediate removal of foreign troops from Afghan territory, was approved by a vote of 30 (U.S.) to 5, with 6 abstentions. (Resolution 1987/5.)

A draft resolution was again introduced in the Commission dealing with the right of self-determination for Palestine. A number of the resolution's preambular and operative paragraphs were directed specifically against Israel. The U.S. Representative called for separate voting on these paragraphs. One paragraph accused Israel of acts of genocide against the Palestinians and ascribed to Israel responsibility for the massacres that occurred at the Sabra and Shatila refugee camps in September 1982. This paragraph was retained by a vote of 22 to 12 (U.S.), with 8 abstentions. The resolution as a whole was approved by a vote of 29 to 6 (U.S.), with 7 abstentions. (Resolution 1987/4.)

A resolution concerning the question of Western Sahara, sponsored by Mozambique and with mainly African cosponsors, which spells out procedures and terms for the political solution of the question, was approved by a vote of 27 to 0, with 15 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 1987/3.)

The question of self-determination for Kampuchea (Cambodia) was addressed in a resolution proposed by the Philippines and cosponsored by other Asian, Western, and Latin American delegations. In its principal operative paragraphs, this resolution reaffirmed that the continuing illegal occupation of Kampuchea by foreign forces deprives the people of Kampuchea of the right to self-determination and constitutes at present the primary violation of human rights in Kampuchea at present. The resolution was approved by a vote of 29 (U.S.) to 8, with 3 abstentions. (Resolution 1987/6.)

Finally, the Commission approved a resolution introduced by the Congo on "The Use of Mercenaries as a Means to Impede the Exercise of the Right of Peoples to Self-Determination," by a vote of 30 to 11 (U.S.), with 1 abstention. (Resolution 1987/16.) The United States opposed this resolution, which urged States to prohibit the recruitment, financing, training, and transit of mercenaries, as outside the Commission's mandate and duplicative of work being done by the UN General Assembly's Sixth Committee.

The first regular session of ECOSOC passed a supporting decision complementary to UN Human Rights Commission Resolution 1987/6. By a vote of 41 (U.S.) to 7, with 2 abstentions, ECOSOC adopted a decision on Kampuchean self-determination proposed by ASEAN and other cosponsors. (Decision 1987/155.) The decision reaffirmed the principal operative paragraphs of Commission Resolution 1987/6, expressed grave concern at the severity and scope of attacks on Kampuchean civilians located in Thai refugee camps and requested the Secretary General to report to ECOSOC any further violations of humanitarian principles perpetrated against Kampuchean civilian refugees by foreign occupying troops along the border. ECOSOC also adopted by a vote of 40 to 12 (U.S.), with 2 abstentions a resolution on "The Use of Mercenaries..." endorsing the UNHRC decision to appoint a Special Rapporteur on Mercenaries. (Resolution 1987/61.)

At the 42nd UN General Assembly, three more resolutions concerning the right to self-determination were approved. A general resolution entitled "Universal Realization of the Right of Peoples to Self-Determination" presented by Pakistan and other cosponsors declared the Assembly's "firm opposition to acts of foreign military intervention, aggression, and occupation, since these have resulted in the suppression of the right of peoples to self-determination and other human rights in certain parts of the world." The resolution was approved without a vote (Resolution 42/94). A much more controversial draft resolution proposed by the African Group contained 41 operative paragraphs featuring numerous provisions directed at the policies of Western states and Israel, both in South Africa and Palestine, and contained a strong call for sanctions against South Africa. The resolution was approved by a vote of 126 to 17 (U.S.), with 10 abstentions. (Resolution 42/95.) Finally, the UN General Assembly approved by a vote of 125 to 10 (U.S.), with 19 abstentions a resolution on "The Use of Mercenaries . . . " welcoming the UNHRC's appointment of a Special Rapporteur. (Resolution 42/96.)

## Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights

Again in 1987, less developed countries' interest in the economic, social, and cultural group of human rights mainly focused on the discussion of a so-called, new human right to development. At its 43rd session, the Commission received another progress report from its Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Right to Development. A representative of Yugoslavia introduced a draft text urging adoption of its draft Declaration on the Right to Development by the 42nd UN General Assembly. The text was adopted by the Commission by consensus. The U.S. delegation did not participate in the vote. (Resolution 1987/23.)

Also adopted under the agenda item relating to economic, social, and cultural rights was a draft resolution proposed by the German Democratic Republic and other co-sponsors which generally was designed to heighten the place given to the economic, social, and cultural group of rights in the Commission's debates. The draft resolution contained a provision recognizing that the realization of the right to development will promote the enjoyment of economic, social, and cultural rights and operative provisions highlighting the importance of economic rights such as the rights to food, to work, and to education and health. This resolution was approved by a vote of 27 to 10 (U.S.), with 5 abstentions. (Resolution 1987/19.) The Australian delegation introduced a resolution on the same subject that passed by consensus. (Resolution 1987/20.) The U.S. delegation reaffirmed the view that economic, social, and cultural progress are the goals of government economic and social policies rather than "rights."

The U.S. delegation sponsored a resolution on the right to own property alone as well as in association with others. The resolution urged States, "to provide, where they had not done so, adequate constitutional and legal provisions to protect the right of everyone to own property alone as well as in association with others." The resolution was adopted with a vote of 30 (U.S.) to 0, with no abstentions. (Resolution 1987/17.) The German Democratic Republic sponsored a resolution on the impact of property on economic and social development. This resolution called upon states to ensure that property ownership would not impair the enjoyment of human rights and condemned transnational corporations operating in South Africa. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 28 to 11 (U.S.) with 2 abstentions. (Resolution 1987/18.)

Finally, the delegation of Yugoslavia carried forward its special interest in the subject of "popular participation in its various forms as an important factor in development and in the full realization of all human rights" by proposing a draft resolution that was procedural in nature, taking note of and requesting the circulation of a study prepared by the Secretary General on the right to popular participation. This resolution was approved without a vote. (Resolution 1987/21.)

At its first regular Session of 1987, ECOSOC approved decision 1987/143 by consensus. This decision endorsed the Commission's Resolution 1987/23 and authorized the convening in January 1988 of the Commission's Working Group of Governmental Experts on the Right to Development. ECOSOC also approved by consensus a resolution on the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights. (Resolution 1987/5.) The resolution urged member states to cooperate with the Committee on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights.

The right to development was the principal subject considered in the UN General Assembly under the agenda item entitled, "Alternative Approaches and Ways and Means Within the UN System for Improving the Effective Enjoyment of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms." The resolution was adopted by a vote of 129 to 1 (U.S.), with 24 abstentions. (Resolution 44/119.) In addition, the Assembly adopted by consensus a resolution on the right to development calling for assistance to developing countries as part of a so-called right to development. (Resolution 42/117.) The U.S. delegation did not participate in the vote.

The UN General Assembly adopted by consensus a resolution introduced by the United States calling for "Respect for the right of everyone to own property alone as well as in association with others and its contribution to the economic and social development of member states." (Resolution 42/114.) The resolution urged member states and specialized agencies to respond as constructively as possible to the request by the Secretary General for comments on the relationship between respect for property and economic and social development. The German Democratic Republic also put forward a resolution on the impact of property on the enjoyment of human rights. (Resolution 42/115.) The General Assembly adopted the resolution by a vote of 124 to 24 (U.S.) with 2 abstentions.

## Human Rights of Persons Subjected to Detention or Imprisonment

The Human Rights Commission annually examines as a continuing area of human rights concern the question of the human rights of all persons subjected to any form of detention or imprisonment. Connected with this agenda item are the subissues of torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment, the question of enforced or involuntary disappearances, the question of human rights in the administration of justice, and the right to freedom of expression and opinion.

The subject of torture was addressed in three resolutions approved under this agenda item. A resolution sponsored by Norway and other, mainly Western, delegations dealt with the status of the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. The resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1987/30.)

Also adopted without a vote was a resolution, again put forward by Norway and, which the United States joined as cosponsor, encouraging support for the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture. (Resolution 1987/31.)

Finally, a resolution was put forward by Belgium, which the United States joined as cosponsor, extending the mandate of the Special Rapporteur appointed to examine questions relevant to torture. This resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1987/29.)

Concerning the subject of enforced or involuntary disappearances, France once again took the lead in proposing a resolution by which the Commission decided to extend for 1 year the mandate of its Working Group. The resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1987/27.) France also introduced a resolution on hostage taking that the United States joined as cosponsor. The resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1987/28.)

The Commission also adopted without a vote a resolution on human rights in the administration of justice. (Resolution 1987/33.) The resolution called for member states to provide effective legislation and other mechanisms to ensure effective implementation of international standards relating to human rights in the administration of justice. Finally, the Commission adopted without a vote a resolution on the rights to freedom of expression and opinion. (Resolution 1987/32.)

At the First Regular Session of ECOSOC, the mandate of a Special Rapporteur to examine questions relevant to torture was extended by consensus for 1 year. (Decision 1987/146.)

At the General Assembly, resolutions 42/122 and 42/123, both adopted without votes, dealt with the subjects of the UN Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture and the status of the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, respectively, in terms similar to those already contained in the two resolutions adopted earlier in the year on the same subjects by the UN Human Rights Commission.

The subject of enforced or involuntary disappearances was again addressed by a resolution proposed by France and other cosponsors. The resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 42/142.) Human Rights in the administration of justice was also addressed by the General Assembly. The resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 42/143.)

## Drafting of International Human Rights Instruments

Human rights standard-setting through the drafting of conventions or declarations proceeded in 1987 in five areas.

### A. Rights of the Child

A Working Group of the Commission on Human Rights met for 1 week prior to the opening of the 43rd session of the Commission to carry on its work of elaborating a draft Convention on the Rights of the Child. The work has been underway since 1979. At its 1987 session, the Working Group adopted nine additional articles. Having received the report of its Working Group, the Commission adopted without a vote resolution 1987/48. Under this resolution the Commission decided to continue at its 44th session, as a matter of highest priority, its work on the elaboration of a draft Convention. A 1-week session of the Working Group was scheduled to be held prior to the 44th UNHRC session.

The First Regular Session of ECOSOC adopted a resolution noting Commission resolution 1987/48 and authorizing a 1-week meeting of the open-ended Working Group to take place before the 44th session of the Commission. (Resolution 1987/58.)

At the 42nd General Assembly, another procedural resolution on the question of a Convention on the Rights of the Child was adopted with a vote of 154 to 0, with 1 (U.S.) abstention. (Resolution 42/101.) The resolution generally encouraged the Commission to proceed with its work on the draft Convention and to make every effort at its 44th session to complete the draft Convention. The U.S. delegation voted against the resolution because it overrode the Commission by authorizing an additional week of meetings for the Working Group.

### B. Human Rights of Migrant Workers

A Working Group on the drafting of an International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Their Families was established by the UN General Assembly in 1979. One session of this Working Group was held in 1987 during the 42nd session of the General Assembly from September 22-October 2. The Working Group continued the second reading of a heavily bracketed text, adopting a number of provisions. Both the Commission and the Assembly have been following the work of the Working Group with special interest. At the 43rd UNHRC, a resolution proposed by Mexico, adopted without a vote, welcomed the progress which the Working Group had been making. (Resolution 1987/43.) By a vote of 150 to 1 (U.S.), with 3 abstentions, the 42nd General Assembly adopted resolution 42/140 which expressed satisfaction at the progress reported by the Working Group and provided for two further sessions of the Working Group in 1988 to continue the second reading of the draft Convention. The United States voted against the resolution because it questions the need for this Convention, believes that to the extent a convention is needed it should be negotiated in the International Labor Organization, and objects to the expenditure by the United Nations of funds to support two meetings in 1988 for such a marginal project.

### C. Rights of Minorities

Work on a draft Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National, Ethnic, Religious, and Linguistic Minorities proceeded during the 43rd UNHRC session. Progress on the drafting of a declaration has been marking time until the key definition of the term "minority" has been supplied to the Commission by its Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities. In resolution 1987/47, adopted without a vote, the Commission decided to establish at its 44th session an open-ended Working Group to continue consideration of the revised Declaration that has been proposed by Yugoslavia.

### D. Human Rights Defenders

The Commission at its 42nd session adopted without a vote a resolution noting the progress of the open-ended Working Group to draft a Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups, and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and it called for the Working Group to reconvene prior to the 44th Session of the Commission. (Resolution 1987/52.)

At its First Regular Session of 1987, ECOSOC approved a resolution authorizing the open-ended Working Group to meet for a period of 1 week prior to the 44th session of the Commission to continue drafting the text of the declaration. (Resolution 1987/59.)

### E. Youth and Human Rights

Following upon a decision taken by the Commission on Human Rights at its 39th (1983) session, the Commission at its 41st session began the pattern of biennial consideration of an item entitled, "The Role of Youth in the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights, Including the Question of Conscientious Objection to Military Service." At its 43rd session, the subject appeared to be of particular interest to Communist delegations, who were among the main cosponsors of two draft resolutions. One draft resolution, sponsored by Bulgaria, dealt with the role of youth in achieving the objectives of the International Youth Year: Participation, Development, Peace. The operative paragraphs generally stressed the role of youth in promoting the full and effective enjoyment of human rights and reaffirmed the fact that youth attach crucial importance to the promotion of international peace and cooperation. The objectives of the International Youth Year were also highlighted. This resolution was adopted with a vote of 34 to 0, with 8 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 1987/44.)

The other resolution, presented by the Delegation of the Byelorussian S.S.R., on behalf mainly of Communist cosponsors, was somewhat repetitive of the previous resolution in also emphasizing the role of youth in the promotion and protection of human rights. The resolution emphasized the importance of the exercise and use by young people of all human rights, "including the right to education and vocational training and the right to work, with a view to ensuring full employment and the solution of the problem of unemployment among young people." This resolution was also adopted with a vote of 41 to 0, with 1 (U.S.) abstention. (Resolution 1987/45.)

A third resolution, sponsored by Austria, Costa Rica, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, and the United Kingdom, dealt with conscientious objection to military service. Debate on this draft resolution revealed sharp differences of view among Western and Communist delegations over the importance of conscientious objection in national societies, especially over its characterization as a right. The Commission adopted the resolution in a vote of 26 (U.S.) to 2, with 14 abstentions. (Resolution 1987/46.)

At the UN General Assembly, further discussion of youth and human rights took place under agenda items dealing with (a) the International Youth Year, and (b) policies and programs relating to youth. Four resolutions (Resolutions 42/52, 42/53, 42/54, 42/55) were adopted, all without a vote. For discussion of these resolutions see the subsection on Youth under the Section on Social Development.

## Review of the Work of the Subcommission on Minorities

Due to budgetary reasons, the Subcommission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities did not meet in 1986. The 43rd session of the Commission passed, without a vote a resolution calling on the Secretary General to ensure that the Subcommission would meet in 1987. (Resolution 1987/35.) The Commission also adopted without a vote a resolution put forward by Norway urging the Working Group on Indigenous Populations of the Subcommission to continue its review of developments pertaining to the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms of indigenous populations.

The 39th (1987) session of the Subcommission was held August 10-September 4.

## Violations of Human Rights

The recurring item on the Commission's annual agenda which relates to violations of human rights in any part of the world, again occupied a major part of the Commission's time at its 43rd session. A sub-item concerning human rights situations in particular countries was brought to the Commission's attention under the confidential procedures established by ECOSOC resolution 1503 (XLVIII). Although the Subcommission did not meet in 1986 for reasons of budgetary constraint, the Chairman announced the Commission had decided to take up in private sessions the human rights situations in four cases (Albania, Haiti, Paraguay, Zaire) continued from 1986.

The Chairman also announced that consideration of the situation relating to Haiti would be terminated.

The public debate under the violations agenda item was, as usual, marked by general statements by a large number of the Commission members surveying the state of human rights throughout the world. Ambassador Wallach explained the concerns of the United States Government over negative human rights developments in Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Iran, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Poland, Romania, South Africa, the Soviet Union, Suriname, and Vietnam. He characterized Cuba as "the single most flagrant case of systematic violation of human rights in the Americas." "In Nicaragua," he added, "the Sandinistas continue to clamp down on the exercise of civil and political rights... As in Cuba, yet another revolution is betrayed." In public session, the Commission adopted several resolutions dealing with separate country situations. Concerning the human rights situation in El Salvador, the Commission received another report from its Special Representative, Mr. Pastor Ridruejo, and acted upon a draft resolution sponsored by Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Greece, Mexico, Norway, Costa Rica, France, Mexico, Peru, Spain, Venezuela, and Yugoslavia. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 36 (U.S.) to 0, with 7 abstentions. (Resolution 1987/51.) The resolution extended the mandate of the Special Representative for another year and more closely reflected the actual situation in that country.

With respect to the human rights situation in Guatemala, the Commission received another report from its Rapporteur, Viscount Colville of Culross. A draft resolution was proposed by Norway with Australia, Austria, Canada, and Ireland as cosponsors. The Norwegian resolution recognized the progress made by Guatemala but called for an extension of the mandate of the Special Rapporteur. Venezuela also introduced a draft resolution cosponsored by all the Latin countries except Nicaragua and Cuba. The Venezuelan draft sought to terminate the mandate of the Special Rapporteur. A consensus text was drafted terminating the mandate of the Special Rapporteur and appointing an expert to provide Guatemala with advisory services. The compromise resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1987/53.) At the 44th session of the Commission, the report of the expert will be considered under "advisory services" (Agenda item 22) rather than "human rights violations anywhere" (Agenda item 12).

The Rapporteur on human rights in Afghanistan, Mr. Felix Ermacora, presented another report to the Commission on the basis of which a draft resolution was proposed by Belgium and other, mainly Western, cosponsors. The draft resolution reviewed the details of widespread grave and massive human rights violations being committed in Afghanistan and urged "the authorities in Afghanistan" to put a stop to them. The mandate of the Special Rapporteur was extended for another year. The resolution was approved by a vote of 26 (U.S.) to 8, with 7 abstentions. (Resolution 1987/58.)

Concerning human rights in Iran, the Commission heard the report of the Special Representative, Mr. R. Galindo Pohl. The Commission also considered a draft resolution introduced by Norway and cosponsored by several Western countries. It expressed deep concern at the number and gravity of violations of human rights in Iran, including the situation of minority groups such as the Baha'is as indicated in the Special Rapporteur's interim report, and extended the Rapporteur's mandate for another year. The Pakistan delegation moved to take no action on the resolution. The motion was defeated in an unexpectedly close tie vote of 16 to 16 (U.S.), with 10 abstentions. The substantive resolution on the human rights situation in Iran was adopted by a vote of 18 (U.S.) to 5, with 16 abstentions. (Resolution 1987/55.)

A resolution on the situation in the Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon was introduced by Democratic Yemen and cosponsored by Egypt, Iraq, Libya, Madagascar, and Tunisia. The resolution noted the grave situation in the Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon and condemned Israeli attacks on the camps. The resolution passed with a vote of 29 to 2, with 12 (U.S.) abstentions. In an explanation of vote, the U.S. delegation emphasized its concern over the plight of the Palestinians but noted that it could not vote for a resolution that referred to a statement by the Palestine Liberation Organization in which the U.S. was criticized. (Resolution 1987/49.)

A resolution on the situation in southern Lebanon was proposed by India with Arab and Soviet cosponsors. The draft resolution expressed grave concern over Israeli action in southern Lebanon, strongly condemned human rights violations by Israel, called on Israel to put an immediate end to repressive practices and to release detained and abducted persons. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 26 to 1 (U.S.), with 15 abstentions. (Resolution 1987/54.)

Argentina submitted a resolution on the situation of human rights in Sri Lanka that was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1987/61.)

Finally, the Commission considered a resolution sponsored by the Cypriot delegation concerning the situation of human rights in Cyprus. The resolution passed with a vote of 25 to 3 (U.S.), with 15 abstentions. The U.S. delegation voted against the resolution because it did not present an accurate picture of the facts. (Resolution 1987/50.)

In addition to the foregoing country-specific resolutions, the Commission adopted two resolutions dealing with human rights problems in general. The Commission approved, without a vote, a resolution proposed by Norway and other cosponsors concerning the continuing problem of summary or arbitrary executions in various parts of the world. The resolution's text was based upon a report submitted to the Commission by its Special Rapporteur, Mr. S. Amos Wako. The mandate of the Special Rapporteur was continued for another year. (Resolution 1987/57.)

A resolution proposed by Australia and other cosponsors, also approved without a vote, concerned the subject of human rights and mass exoduses. This resolution was another in a series of resolutions which have expressed the Commission's continuing concern over this problem. (Resolution 1987/56.)

At the First Regular Session of ECOSOC, the Commission's resolution on summary or arbitrary executions, the text of which had been phrased in terms calling for ECOSOC approval, was approved without a vote. (Resolution 1987/60.)

Also adopted by consensus was Resolution 1987/59 authorizing an open-ended Working Group to meet for 1 week prior to the 44th session of the Commission to continue working on a draft declaration on the right and responsibility of individuals, groups, and organs of society to promote and protect universally recognized human rights and fundamental freedoms (Human Rights Defenders Declaration).

Also approved were extensions of the mandates of individuals dealing with four country situations as follows: the Special Representative on human rights in El Salvador, without a vote (Decision 1987/48); the Special Rapporteur on human rights in Afghanistan, without a vote (Decision 1987/151); and the Special Representative on human rights in Iran, by a vote of 22 (U.S.) to 7, with 16 abstentions. (Decision 1987/150.) ECOSOC also approved, without a vote, the Commission's resolution terminating the mandate of the Special Rapporteur for Guatemala and substituting advisory services. (Decision 1987/149.)

The 42nd General Assembly considered the usual concentration of country situations in Latin America (Chile, El Salvador, and Guatemala), as well as Afghanistan and Iran.

A draft resolution on human rights in Afghanistan, proposed mainly by Western European cosponsors, which repeated the Commission's concern over the widespread violations of human rights in Afghanistan as revealed by the Special Rapporteur, was approved by a vote of 94 (U.S.) to 22, with 31 abstentions. (Resolution 42/135.)

A draft resolution on human rights in El Salvador was approved without a vote. (Resolution 42/137.) The General Assembly also adopted a draft resolution on human rights in Iran by a vote of 64 (U.S.) to 22, with 45 abstentions. (Resolution 42/136.) The Assembly also adopted without a vote a resolution on summary or arbitrary executions. (Resolution 42/141.) These resolutions largely echoed the provisions of resolutions adopted earlier in the year by the Commission on Human Rights and ECOSOC and expressed support for the efforts of the Commission's Special Rapporteurs to assist the Commission in coping with human rights problems throughout the world.

A draft resolution on human rights and mass exoduses was proposed in terms similar to those contained in the resolution of the Commission on Human Rights adopted earlier in the year and called for continued attention to the problem of mass exoduses of refugees and displaced persons, including its root causes. The resolution was approved without a vote. (Resolution 42/144.) The General Assembly also adopted without a vote a resolution on summary or arbitrary executions. (Resolution 42/141.)

## Human Rights in Chile

Unlike other country situations that were considered by the Commission on Human Rights at its 43rd session under the item relating to human rights violations in any part of the world, the question of human rights in Chile was again considered under a separate agenda item. In accordance with the practice of many previous sessions, Mexico joined with other cosponsors in presenting a draft resolution. The resolution described in relatively balanced terms the human rights situation in Chile and provided for a year's extension of the mandate of the Special Rapporteur. The resolution noted the progress reflected in the report of the Special Rapporteur, former Costa Rican Foreign Minister Fernando Volio Jimenez, as well as the remaining obstacles to democracy. The resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1987/60.)

At the First Regular Session of ECOSOC, the Commission's decision to extend the mandate of its Special Rapporteur on Chile for 1 year was approved without a vote. (Decision 1987/132.)

At the 42nd UN General Assembly, a draft resolution on the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Chile was again proposed by Mexico, in company with other cosponsors. The Assembly had before it a preliminary report from the Special Rapporteur. The draft resolution was approved by a vote of 93 to 5, with 53 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 42/147.) The United States abstained because the resolution, while more balanced than in previous years, failed to reflect the progress toward democracy recorded in the Volio report.

## Advisory Services

Under the Human Rights Advisory Services Program, which is based upon General Assembly resolution 926 (X) adopted in 1955, the Secretary General reports annually to the Commission on Human Rights. His report covers three aspects of the Program: advisory services of experts, fellowships and scholarships, and seminars. At the 43rd session of the Commission on Human Rights, three resolutions were adopted under the Advisory Services item. A general resolution, proposed by the Federal Republic of Germany on behalf of a number of cosponsors, was designed to record the Commission's continuing interest in this program; the resolution's operative paragraphs encouraged the Secretary General to promote activities under the Program.

The resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1987/37.) The Commission also adopted without a vote a resolution on the Voluntary Fund for advisory services and technical assistance in the field of human rights. (Resolution 1987/38.)

In resolution 1987/36, adopted without a vote, the Commission took note of a report submitted by an expert provided under the Program to the Government of Equatorial Guinea. The Government of Equatorial Guinea was requested to take steps to assist in achieving the goals of the Advisory Services Program.

## Measures Against Totalitarian and Other Ideologies and Practices Based on Terror or Incitement to Racial Discrimination

At its 42nd (1986) session, the Commission briefly considered the agenda item which has traditionally been of special interest to Communist countries entitled, "Measures to be taken against all totalitarian or other ideologies and practices, including Nazi, fascist, and neofascist, based on racial or ethnic exclusiveness or intolerance, hatred, terror, systematic denial of human rights, or fundamental freedoms or which have such consequences." An omnibus resolution submitted by Communist countries containing many provisions declaiming against the alleged resurgance of Nazi and fascist ideologies since the Second World War and calling for measures to combat these evils was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 1986/61.) At the 41st General Assembly, a resolution on the same subject was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 41/60.)

At the 42nd (1986) session, the Commission passed an amendment to the resolution deciding to consider this item biennially. It was, therefore, not on the agenda in 1987.

## Status of the International Covenants on Human Rights

A recurring item on the agenda of the Commission on Human Rights concerns the status of the International Covenants on Human Rights, which is the subject of an annual report to the Commission submitted by the Secretary General. At its 43rd session the Commission approved, without a vote, a draft resolution presented by Norway and other cosponsors which constituted a general appeal for more states to become parties to the Covenants and stressed the need for smoother functioning implementation mechanisms under the Covenants. (Resolution 1987/26.) On the initiative of the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany, the Commission adopted without a vote a decision concerning the elaboration of a Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights aiming at the abolition of the death penalty. (Decision 1987/104.)

The Commission also approved, without a vote, a Byelorussian S.S.R. draft resolution on the crime of genocide which urged all States which have not yet done so to ratify the Genocide Convention. (Resolution 1987/25.)

The First Regular Session of ECOSOC also adopted a resolution calling for states to ratify the International Covenants.

The 42nd UN General Assembly adopted, without a vote, a resolution which again urged governments to become parties to the Covenants and to support actively their implementation mechanisms. (Resolution 42/103.) The 42nd General Assembly also adopted without a vote a resolution dealing with reporting obligations of states parties to UN conventions on human rights. The resolution was based on a report submitted by the Secretary General which addressed the growing problem of the failure of states parties to various UN conventions to comply in a timely manner with their reporting obligations under these conventions. In its operative paragraphs, the resolution drew attention to this problem and exhorted governments to improve compliance with their reporting obligations. A number of measures to assist states in carrying out their reporting obligations were also put forward in the resolution. (Resolution 42/105.) In addition, the General Assembly adopted, without, a vote a resolution on the status of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide urging states that had not already done so to ratify the Convention. (Resolution 42/133.) Finally, the General Assembly adopted by consensus a resolution proclaiming 1990 as International Literacy Year. (Resolution 42/104.)

## Regional Arrangements

Carrying forth its interest in promoting the establishment of regional institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights in the Asian-Pacific Region, the Commission at its 43rd session adopted without a vote a draft resolution proposed by the delegation of Sri Lanka and cosponsored by Australia, China, and the Philippines. The draft resolution invited further comments from governments which had not yet commented on the report of the seminar on regional arrangements in the Asian region, held in Colombo in 1982. In addition, the Secretary General was requested, in cooperation with the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific and governments of the region, to consider the establishment of a training course on teaching human rights materials. The Secretary General was requested to report on the matter to the 44th Commission session. (Resolution 1987/41.)

## Science and Technology

Although the Human Rights Commission has decided to consider the human rights implications of science and technology on a biennial basis, and it did not take up the question at its 1987 session, the item occurs regularly on the agenda of ECOSOC and the UN General Assembly. The First Regular Session of ECOSOC adopted a resolution on the use of science and technology in the interest of social and economic development. The resolution called upon states to promote international cooperation to insure scientific and technological progress for the welfare of their peoples. (Resolution 1987/36.)

At the 42nd General Assembly, three resolutions were considered. The first, proposed by the United Kingdom and other cosponsors, focused upon the problem of the abuse of psychiatric institutions as a means of controlling human rights dissent. In the draft resolution, the Assembly reaffirmed its conviction that detention of persons in mental institutions on account of their political views or on other nonmedical grounds is a violation of human rights. The single operative paragraph of the resolution urged the Commission on Human Rights and its Subcommission to expedite consideration of a draft Body of Guidelines, Principles and Guarantees relating to this problem. The resolution was adopted without a vote. (Resolution 42/98.)

Another resolution proposed by the Representative of the U.S.S.R. on behalf of a collection of mainly Communist cosponsors carried forward a favorite Soviet theme which is to utilize the subject of scientific and technological development as a vehicle for turning a human rights debate into one on disarmament. The resolution proposed by the U.S.S.R. contained a number of paragraphs, both preambular and operative, which referred to the horrors of past wars as well as the horrors of nuclear weapons, reaffirmed the importance of the inherent right to life and stressed the urgent need for a halt to the arms race and general and complete disarmament. The United States has regularly opposed such resolutions in human rights forums on the grounds that the complex issues involved are being and should be considered in existing disarmament forums. The draft resolution was approved by a vote of 129 to 9 (U.S.), with 15 abstentions. (Resolution 42/99.)

Another draft resolution proposed by the Byelorussian S.S.R. and cosponsored by mainly Communist delegations centered upon the importance of the implementation of a Declaration on the Use of Scientific and Technological Progress in the Interest of Peace and For the Benefit of Mankind, which had been adopted by the General Assembly in 1975. The United States has always regarded this Declaration as being unbalanced because it unduly emphasizes the relationship between science and technology and the so-called economic human rights, and seems to downplay the importance of the relationship with basic civil and political rights. The resolution was approved by a vote of 131 to 0, with 24 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 42/100.)

## Status of Women

The focus of a series of UN meetings for 1987 was the ability of the United Nations to implement the consensus final document of the Nairobi

World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the UN Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace, held at Nairobi, Kenya, in late 1985.

That document, known as the Forward-Looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women (FLS), represented a constructive departure from the divisive and politicized outcomes of previous conferences held under the aegis of the Decade and set the stage for a major effort to enhance the effectiveness of UN machinery and programs for the advancement of women. At the 1987 special session of the Commission on the Status of Women (CSW) and in the ECOSOC and General Assembly important steps were taken to advance the guidelines of the Forward-Looking Strategies toward concrete initiatives. In this process, the U.S. Representative in the Commission on the Status of Women, Maureen Reagan, continued to play a key role.

## COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

A special session of the CSW, a subsidiary body of the Economic and Social Council, was held in New York, January 12-16.

All of the resolutions and decisions adopted by the CSW were in the form of recommendations to the Council and were subject to Council approval.

The meeting was attended by representatives of 31 of the 32 member states of the Commissions, by observers from 50 other countries, and by representatives of UN Specialized Agencies, UN bodies and intergovernmental organizations, national liberation movements, and nongovernmental organizations.

The Commission elected Olga Pellicer (Mexico) as chairperson; Rabia Bhuiyan (Bangladesh), and Hanne Severinsen as vice chairpersons; and Elena Ramanovich (Byelorussian S.S.R.) as rapporteur.

The special session of the Commission was called to examine the CSW's work program, to revitalize its role within the UN system and to strengthen its capacity to implement The Forward-Looking Strategies to the Year 2000. The major agenda items were: implications of the FLS for program planning in the UN system, monitoring and review and appraisal of the implementation of the FLS; strengthening the CSW and the program of work; and the provisional agenda of the 32nd CSW in 1988.

The agenda item on implications of the FLS for program planning in the UN system received important attention in several of the Commission's meetings. The Commission adopted four resolutions and a draft decision designed to integrate the FLS into the UN's system-wide, medium-term plan on women and development for 1990-1995 and other UN documents.

Under the agenda item on monitoring and review and appraisal of the implementations of the FLS, the Commission considered the system for periodic review of progress in the advancement of women at the national, regional, and international levels as well as the report of the Secretary General on implementation of the FLS. The Commission adopted three resolutions under this item, one resolution concerned methodology for developing and implementing the reporting system for monitoring and review and appraisal of progress in the advancement of women. A second resolution treated the advancement of women employees in the UN system.

The third consensus resolution concerned world conferences. The majority of delegations clearly favored a world conference on women's issues by 1993. Some delegations, e.g., the Soviet and Canadian, argued for world conferences in 1990, 1995, and 2000. After protracted negotiations, a compromise was reached which protected the U.S. position of opposition to fixing a specific date for a world conference before the year 2000. The U.S. representative, Maureen Reagan, gave an explanation of the U.S. position in which she stated that the United States reserved the right to reopen the issue of world conferences in the General Assembly and that the United States believed there were viable alternatives to holding yet another world conference. The resolution as adopted by consensus provides for the CSW to hold a longer than usual session in 1990 to review and appraise progress on implementing the FLS and recommends that the General Assembly authorize world congresses during the decade of the 1990s, at a date to be determined by the Assembly not later than 1990, and in the year 2000.

The delegates addressed aspects of strengthening the CSW in three resolutions spread over four sessions. Many delegations supported the successful U.S. initiative to have CSW meet annually until the year 2000 rather than biennially. African and Latin American delegates proposed enlargement of the CSW, arguing that it no longer reflects the composition of the UN membership. Differing viewpoints on geographical representation presented adoption of the enlargement proposal and it was deferred until the 32nd CSW in 1988, while acknowledging the need to expand membership. The United States made it clear that if the UN Commission on Human Rights were to be the model for enlarging the CSW, it also should be the model for regional distribution of membership.

The U.S. delegation also introduced a proposal to reform, simplify, and depoliticize the traditional agenda of work of the Commission. The U.S. delegation proposed that each of the next five sessions of the CSW concentrate on three priority themes, one each drawn from the three main categories of the Nairobi Forward-Looking Strategies: Equality, Development, and Peace. Under the leadership of Egypt, the G-77 accepted the concept of priority themes and the U.S. framework for dealing with them over competing formulations. The G-77 produced a modification of the U.S. proposal and, following lengthy negotiations, the agreed list of priority items was issued as a draft decision of the chairman and adopted by consensus.

Every session of the Commission shall deal with one subject under the following headings in accordance with the order in which they are numbered:

A. Equality

1. National machinery for monitoring and improving the status of women;

2. Equality in economic and social participation;

3. Political participation and decision-making;

4. Vulnerable women, including migrant women;

5. Elimination of *de jure* and *de facto* discrimination against women.

B. Development

1. Problems of rural women, including food, water resources, agricultural technology, rural employment, transportation, and environment;

2. Education, eradication of illiteracy, employment, health, and social services, *inter alia*, population issues and child care;

3. Negative effects of the present international economic situation on achieving improvement of the status of women;

4. Machineries on the national, regional, and international levels for the effective integration of women in the development process, including nongovernmental organizations;

5. Integration of women in the process of development.

C. Peace

1. Access to information, education for peace and efforts to eradicate violence against women within the family and society;

2. Full participation of women in the construction of their countries and in the creation of just social and political systems;

3. Women in areas affected by armed conflicts, foreign intervention, alien and colonial domination, foreign occupation and threats to peace;

4. Refugee and displaced women and children;

5. Women's equal participation in all efforts for international cooperation, peace, and disarmament.

## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL CONSIDERATION

The Second (Social) Committee of the Economic and Social Council considered the question of the advancement of women (agenda item 19) from 8 to 13 May 1987. The Committee had before it the report of the Commission on the Status of Women on its 1987 session (E/1987/15) and the report of the Board of Trustees of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women (INSTRAW) on its seventh session (E/1987/44).

At the special session in January 1987, of the CSW, the United States had achieved all of the main objectives for which it had been campaigning over the previous 2 years. Especially noteworthy were approval for the annualization of CSW meetings, expansion of the CSW's coordinating mandate, and reform of its agenda.

These achievements were far from being implemented and financial and political problems had not been eliminated. Therefore, the U.S. delegation at ECOSOC was primarily concerned with protecting previous gains and setting the stage for future serious United Nations' work on international women's issues. To avoid circuit overload, the United States did not plan any major new initiatives on women's issues at that ECOSOC session. Although in the ECOSOC some delegations attempted to unravel the decision to annualize meetings of the Commission on the Status of Women, strong and effective U.S. lobbying, refusal to compromise, and strong G-77 support led to their capitulation. After adopting, without a vote, the report of the Commission on the Status of Women, ECOSOC referred it to the special commission of ECOSOC on the in-depth study of UN intergovernmental structure and functions.

In separate actions, the United States expressed reservations about the usefulness of INSTRAW and of a planned commemoration at the 42nd General Assembly of the 10th Anniversary of the UN Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) on financial grounds. The United States also recalled for the record that it is not a member of the UN Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women because the CEDAW raised important states' rights constitutional problems.

## GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION

The Third Committee of the General Assembly dealt with six resolutions under the women's affairs agenda item. They were on the Nairobi Forward-Looking Strategies, INSTRAW, UNIFEM, CEDAW, participation of women in promoting international peace and cooperation, and the role of women. The resolutions were all substantially amended to reflect U.S. concerns, particularly about financial implications. The United States joined consensus on these resolutions.

## SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE IAEA

### World Bank Group

The World Bank Group is composed of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), the International Development Association (IDA), and the International Finance Corporation (IFC). As a member of the UN system and as a development finance institution, the World Bank works with the United Nations and its various specialized agencies in a wide variety of activities. During the Bank Group's fiscal year 1987 (FY 87, ended June 30, 1987), Kiribati joined the IBRD and IDA, bringing IBRD membership to 151 and IDA membership to 135. IFC membership stood at 132 by the fiscal year's end. Membership in IDA was pending for Poland, Portugal, and St. Kitts and Nevis.

The Bank stimulates economic growth in its member countries with loans either at near commercial terms, or at highly concessional terms for sound projects. The Bank traditionally financed all types of capital infrastructure, but in 1980, inaugurated a program of structural adjustment lending to support specific policy changes and institutional reforms in developing countries. Adjustment lending accounted for 23 percent of total IBRD/IDA lending in FY 87.

#### IDA AND IBRD LENDING PROGRAM

The IBRD approved $14.188 billion in loans for FY 87 to support 127 projects in 39 countries, an 8 percent increase over FY 1986. IDA credits amounted to $3.486 billion, up 11 percent from the previous year, for 108 projects in 44 countries.

IDA credits are concentrated in the poorest countries with an annual per capita income of $790 (1984 dollars) or less. Ninety-six percent of IDA lending is directed to countries with annual per capita income below $400. Under the terms of the most recent replenishment (IDA VIII), 45-50 percent of IDA lending is earmarked for the nations of sub-Saharan Africa.

Total IBRD and IDA commitments in FY 87 had the following sector composition:

| Sector | U.S. Dollar Millions | Dollar Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Agriculture and Rural Development | 2,930.3 | 16.6 |
| Development Finance Co's. | 2,297.9 | 13.1 |
| Education | 439.8 | 2.6 |
| Energy | — | — |
| Oil, Coal, and Gas | 687.4 | 4.0 |
| Power | 3,016.9 | 17.1 |
| Industry | 418.4 | 2.5 |
| Nonproject | 2,437.1 | 13.8 |
| Population, Health, and Nutrition | 54.1 | n/a |
| Small Scale Enterprise | 421.5 | 2.5 |
| Technical Assistance | 103.9 | 0.1 |
| Telecommunications | 682.3 | 3.9 |
| Transportation | 1,745.9 | 9.9 |
| Urban Development | 1,469.1 | 8.4 |
| Water Supply and Sewerage | 969.4 | 5.5 |
| TOTAL | 17,674 .0 | 100.0 |

Projects approved by the IBRD and IDA during FY 87 had the following regional distribution:

| Region | Projects | U.S. Dollars Millions | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| Eastern and Southern Africa | 41 | 763.6 | 4.3 |
| Western Africa | 37 | 1,334.1 | 7.5 |
| East Asia and Pacific | 33 | 3,349.4 | 19.0 |
| South Asia | 32 | 3,979.4 | 22.5 |
| Europe, Middle East, and N. Africa | 34 | 3,095.5 | 17.5 |
| Latin America and Caribbean | 58 | 5,152.0 | 29.2 |
| TOTAL | 235 | 17,674.0 | 100.0 |

Barber Conable became the seventh president of the World Bank effective July 1, 1986, replacing A.W. Clausen who had served as President for 5 years.

With U.S. support, the World Bank's Board of Governors approved a draft Convention for the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA). There are now almost 70 signatories to the Convention, including the United States. MIGA is expected to commence operations during 1988.

MIGA, which has as its goal increasing private investment flows to developing countries, is endowed with authority to issue guarantees against noncommercial risk and to provide a wide range of technical assistance and consultative activities.

During fiscal year 1987 the Special Facility for sub-Saharan Africa, created in May 1987, approved 12 operations totaling $421 million. These operations were in support of countries that had undertaken or were committed to undertake appropriate medium-term programs of policy reform.

Negotiations for the eighth replenishment of IDA were concluded during fiscal year 1987. The replenishment totaled $12.4 billion.

## INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION (IFC)

The IFC assists the economic development of its borrowing member countries by making loans to, and equity investments in, productive enterprises in the private sector; matching investment opportunities with domestic and foreign private capital and experienced management; helping to develop local and regional capital markets; and promoting privately owned development finance corporations. Projects are selected on the basis of financial viability and their contribution to economic development.

The IFC approved $920 million for 92 projects in 42 countries during FY 87. The number of companies in which IFC holds investments rose from 377 to 404 by fiscal year end 1987. These investments are broadly distributed among 77 countries. During FY 87, IFC's activities in the capital markets area expanded with the creation of an Emerging Markets Growth Fund and three country funds aimed at promoting international portfolio investment. The IFC also expanded its range of advisory services to governments and businesses in the developing world.

## International Monetary Fund

Use of IMF resources continued to decline in 1987 as the world economy achieved moderate growth in its fifth year of sustained recovery. Drawings on IMF loans totaled Special Drawing Rights (SDR)* 3.7 billion in 1987, a slight decline from 3.9 billion in 1986. Drawings had peaked at SDR 13.2 billion in 1983, falling to SDR 7.3 billion in 1984 and 4 billion in 1985. New loan commitments declined slightly to SDR 3.4 billion from SDR 3.9 billion in 1986.

Aggregate IMF general credit outstanding at the end of 1987 declined to SDR 28.7 billion from SDR 33.3 billion in 1986. Aggregate credit outstanding peaked in 1985 at a level of SDR 35.2 billion. This 2-year decline is not solely attributable to improved economic performance, but results as well from net repayments on the high level of IMF lending extended from 1982-1984 which coincided with a major world recession and the onset of the debt crisis.

In spite of improved growth in some developing countries, developments in the international economy in 1987 were mixed. Many developing countries continued to face debt servicing problems and arrears to the IMF continued to increase rapidly, reaching an unprecedented total of SDR 1.7 billion of which 55 percent were overdue more than 1 year.

As in recent years, only developing countries borrowed IMF resources. Of total drawings, 75 percent were made under standby and extended programs. These programs, developed jointly by a member country and the IMF, aim to achieve balance of payments viability in the medium term as the basis for sustainable noninflationary growth. In 1987 the IMF continued to emphasize growth in its program design. During the year, the IMF approved 11 new standby programs and 1 extended program compared with 23 standbys approved in 1986. At the end of 1987, 22 stand-by and 2 extended programs were active, compared with 30 standby and 1 extended program active at the end of 1986.

Drawings under the Compensatory Financing Facility (CFF) amounted to SDR 1.2 billion in 1987, twice the drawings in 1986. The CFF is available to members facing payment difficulties resulting from temporary shortfalls in export earnings or surges in food import costs that are due largely to conditions beyond the member's control. Over the last 3 years, drawings under this facility have averaged SDR .9 billion per annum, a significant decline from average drawings of SDR 2.1 billion in the first 3 years of the decade.

In recent years the IMF has recognized that its medium-term resources are not well-suited to addressing entrenched structural problems which are often at the root of the poorest countries' balance of payments difficulties. To address this problem, in 1986 the IMF created the Structural Adjustment Facility (SAF) financed by repayment of loans extended in the 1970's from the IMF Trust Fund. SAF loans support 3-year adjustment programs in tandem with World Bank (IBRD) programs under a framework jointly developed by eligible members with the two organizations. The longer duration of SAF programs and their repayment at concessional interest rates over 5 years, after a 5-year grace period, allows beneficiaries to undertake major structural policy reform to provide a basis for sustained growth. At the Venice Summit, the Managing Director of the IMF called for a major increase in resources for the SAF. The Summit Communique welcomed the Managing Director's initiative and at year end, the Fund created the Enhanced SAF. The enhancement was funded by member contributions of SDR 6 billion in loans to the IMF. Some members also made grant contributions to permit the IMF to onlend borrowed funds at concessional rates. The United States did contribute to the expansion. In 1987 the IMF approved 13 new SAF programs with total commitments of SDR 841 million. A total of SDR 480 million was disbursed under the 22 active SAF payments. The ESAF was not established until late in the year and ESAF operations will not commence until 1988.

---

*The SDR is the unit of account used by the IMF. A composite of the U.S. dollar, French franc, German mark, British pound sterling and Japanese yen, the SDR was worth $1.42 on December 31, 1987. The average value of the SDR in 1987 was $1.29.

A total of 151 countries are members of the IMF. With the exception of the Soviet Union and several Eastern European countries, most developed and developing countries are members.

## International Fund for Agricultural Development

The International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) was founded in 1977 with strong leadership from the United States. IFAD's mandate is to increase food production in the developing countries through loans for projects benefiting small farmers and landless poor. IFAD has been financed by a negotiated ratio of contributions from members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and members of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), as well as small amounts from some of the more prosperous developing countries. IFAD has a unique governing structure that accords equal numbers of votes to the three groups of members—OECD (Category I), OPEC (Category II), and non-OPEC developing countries (Category III) although decisions normally have been by consensus.

The President of IFAD is Idriss Jazairy from Algeria. The Vice President is a former U.S. development official, Donald Brown. IFAD has approximately 80 professional employees, of whom 7 are Americans. Two other senior officers, Chief of Administrative Services (Gordon Munson) and Senior Advisor to the the President (Mohiuddin Alamgir) are U.S. citizens.

The Administrator of the Agency for International Development (AID) is the United States for IFAD. The United States is the only country which enjoys a permanent seat on IFAD's Executive Board, the body which approves projects and determines policy. All other countries must rotate on and off the 36-member Board.

IFAD is primarily a facilitating and cofinancing institution. It cofinances more than two-thirds of its portfolio with other multilateral and bilateral institutions. The United States and other donors have encouraged cofinancing as a means of engaging other international financial institutions increasingly in small farmer development activities. Many of IFAD's loans (43 percent) fund projects are designed by other international lending institutions, chiefly the World Bank and the regional development banks, with input from IFAD specifically on the small farmer and landless laborer aspects.

Two-thirds of IFAD's resources are provided on "highly concessional" terms—1 percent interest, with 50-year repayment and 10-year grace periods. These terms are available to countries with a per capita GNP of $450 per year or less. Countries with a per capita GNP of $450 to $900 per year normally receive loans on "intermediate" terms of 4 percent interest, 5 years' grace and 20 years' repayment. A few loans have been made on "ordinary" terms—8 percent interest, 3 years' grace and 15-18 years' repayment, all to countries with a per capita GNP over $900 per year.

After two and a half years of negotiations between Category I and Category II members, an agreement was concluded in January 1986 during the Ninth Session of the Governing Council to fund a second replenishment (IFAD II) at a level of $460 million with OECD members contributing $276 million (60 percent) and OPEC members contributing $184 million (40 percent). Because of the difficulties which OPEC countries experienced due to lower oil revenues, the second replenishment was less than half the size of IFAD's initial capitalization or first replenishment. The United States, IFAD's largest donor, has pledged $79,840,000 toward the second replenishment (17 percent of the total) of which $18,710,000 was contributed during FY-1987.

At the 32nd session of the IFAD Executive Board, December 1-4, the United States introduced the concept of an evaluative body for IFAD operations. It was supported by the IFAD President, Secretariat, and Category I and II countries and led to the establishment of a 10-country Executive Board Evaluation Committee. The Committee gives donors a better opportunity to assess IFAD's project proposals on a "lessons learned" basis from an evaluation of completed projects, and serves as a communication link between IFAD's management and its members in the evolution of development strategies. This proposal went before IFAD's Executive Board for review and becomes operational in 1988.

During 1987 IFAD approved 25 projects valued at $169.6 million and 38 technical assistance grants and loans worth about $10.5 million. Total loans and grants in operation equaled approximately $180 million.

IFAD has launched a Special Program for Sub-Saharan African Countries Affected by Drought and Desertification. This program seeks to generate an additional $300 million in voluntary contributions for a 5-year effort to rehabilitate the agricultural systems of countries most affected by drought and desertification. The United States contributed $10 million toward this progam in 1987, and other donors pledged or contributed approximately $190 million.

IFAD did not hold a Governing Council meeting in 1987. Instead, at the 10th session, held in December 1986, the Governing Council established a High-level Intergovernmental Committee, consisting of up to 12 members from each Category, to consider matters related to the future financial basis and structure of the Fund. That Committee held three meetings during 1987 in Rome and concentrated largely on the framework for the Third Replenishment negotiations. There was general agreement that those negotiations should strive to preserve the unique character of IFAD.

The atmosphere of these high-level intergovernmental Committee meetings were constructive but, by the end of 1987, no conclusions had been reached regarding the third replenishment other than the expectation that its level would probably fall somewhere in the range of $600 million.

## Food and Agriculture Organization

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), one of the largest UN specialized agencies, is the lead international organization in the fields of agriculture, fisheries, and forestry. FAO's agriculture program attempts to bring about a sustained global improvement in nutrition levels, food security, and rural incomes, especially for the disadvantaged, through increasing rural productivity. Its fisheries program promotes improved management and utilization of the world's fishery resources, particularly by helping developing countries to increase their capacity to manage their marine and inland fisheries. The FAO forestry program, the smallest of the three, assists member countries to find a balance between environmental concerns and the growing demand for forest goods and services and increasing pressures of agriculture on forest land. These FAO goals are consistent with the aims of U.S. bilateral development assistance programs.

FAO is governed by its Conference, to which all the member states of the Organization belong. The Conference is held biennially in odd-numbered years to review FAO's performance and to adopt the Program of Work and Budget for the coming 2 years. Between Conference sessions, the 49-member FAO Council directs the work of the Organization. In even-numbered years, here are regional conferences in each of FAO's five geographic regions and a all session of the Council. FAO is unusual among specialized agencies in that he Soviet Union is not a member. Having been a member of the 1944 Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture, which was instrumental in the

best copy available

founding of FAO, the Soviet Union would need only to declare its desire to be a member of FAO, and it would become one without the necessity of a vote on its admission. The Soviet Union, however, has never opted to join.

## FAO COUNCIL

The 91st session of the FAO Council took place in Rome, June 15-26. The Council began with a stormy confrontation between pro-reform and anti-reform members when a point of order was raised to strike from the record, as out of order, all statements on budgetary reform contained in the U.S. intervention on the FAO Program of Work and Budget. Although most major donors on the Council supported the United States, the Council sustained the point of order by a vote of 30 to 9 (U.S.), with 10 abstentions. As a consequence, the Council did not deliberate on the pressing topic of reform. Nevertheless, the United States and other reform-minded donors did succeed in putting the issue of reform on the agenda for the November 1987 Conference.

Regarding the FAO Summary Program of Work and Budget (SPWB), the United States expressed concern about the nominal budget growth and pointed out that, due to shifts in the dollar/lira rate of exchange, adoption of the budget proposed in the SPWB would result in significant increases in assessments for a number of members. The United States urged the Director General to consider further adjustments to the budget that would make it more consistent with likely income for the next biennium.

In addressing the current food situation, the United States complimented the FAO for its work in combatting the African locust problem. A number of countries called for a progress report on the International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides, with some suggesting that it was time for the code to be amended to include the principle of "prior informed consent," which concerns giving prior consent to the importation of certain pesticides. The United States stated that the code had been in the hands of governments for little more than a year and that the proposed amendment should be discussed by an FAO technical body before being addressed at the Council or Conference. It was decided that a progress report on the code would be put on the agenda of the next Council.

The 92nd session of the Council was held in Rome, November 3-5, as a preliminary to the 24th Conference. One of its primary tasks was to nominate a Chairman for the Conference. In a secret ballot, Faisal Abdul Razzak Al-Khaled (Kuwait) was elected over Colin Moyle (New Zealand) by a vote of 27 to 20 (U.S.), with one abstention. The United States supported Mr. Moyle on the principle of rotation of the Conference Chair among regional groups, it being the turn for the Southwest Pacific Group. Following the announcement of Al-Khaled's victory, Denmark, speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries, made a strong statement of reproval of the outcome of the election because it violated the principle of regional rotation that traditionally had been respected in UN organizations, including FAO.

At the insistence of a number of members, but contrary to the wishes of the United States, the Council recommended that the International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides be added to the Conference agenda.

The U.S. Delegation informed the Council that the United States would not support the proposed FAO budget when it came up in the Conference because of its unrealistic projection of income.

At the 93rd session of the Council, held immediately after the Conference on November 28, the United States was elected to a seat on the Finance Committee for the 1988-1989 biennium. Canada was elected to the Program Committee, therby securing membership for the North American Regional Group on both committees.

## FAO CONFERENCE

The 24th session of the Conference was held in Rome, November 7-27. The U.S. Delegation was led by Secretary of Agriculture Richard E. Lyng.

On the second day of the Conference, Edouard Saouma (Lebanon) was reelected in a secret ballot for a third term as Director General of FAO by a vote of 94-59, defeating Moise Mensah (Benin), who had been openly supported by the United States and most major donor countries.

In his address to the Conference, Secretary Lyng reiterated the traditionally strong U.S. support for FAO. Making reference to a recent U.S. proposal for reform of the international rules governing agricultural trade, he pointed out how this would improve prospects for agricultural production, especially in developing countries.

Two major issues addressed by the Conference were FAO's financial situation and the question of reform. The United States voted against the FAO Program of Work and Budget for the 1988-1989 biennium for not reflecting fiscal restraint in terms of U.S. budgetary policy for international organizations of zero real growth and maximum absorption of non-discretionary cost increases. Nevertheless, the budget was adopted by a vote of 99 to 4 (U.S.), with 7 abstentions. In nominal terms, the working budget amount amounted to nearly $482 million for the 1988-1989 biennium, which represents a 10.26 percent increase over the 1986-1987 budget including net real growth of .25 percent. The total U.S. assessment rose by nearly 30 percent for 1988 and 1989 to $64.695 million per annum.

The question of reform was debated extensively in the Second Commission of the Conference. The United States sponsored a resolution, supported by most major donors, for reform of the budgetary process. The

Nordic countries sponsored a resolution, supported by the United States and most major donors, for a comprehensive review of FAO's programs, priorities, and management to be conducted by a high-level group of independent experts. Both proposals were supported by detailed documentation prepared by the donors and included in the Conference documentation. A special contact group on reform met for 8 days to try to resolve differences regarding these resolutions. The contact group had limited success: it reached agreement on terms of reference for a comprehensive review of FAO, but could not resolve the question of what mechanism to use for conducting the review. It did not arrive at an agreement on the U.S. proposal for budgetary reform. As a consequence, the Conference rejected the U.S.-sponsored resolution for budgetary reform by a vote of 14 (U.S.) to 60, with 14 abstentions. The Conference amended the Nordic resolution so that the review of FAO would be entrusted to the Program and Finance Committees, rather than to a high-level group of independent experts. Following this amendment which was felt to jeopardize the objectivity of the review, the Nordics, the United States, and other major donors withdrew support for the resolution. The Conference adopted it, nonetheless, by a vote of 80 to 5 (U.S.), with 14 abstentions.

## OTHER CONFERENCE ISSUES

In a statement on the FAO field program, the United States pointed out the need for improvements in project design, in backstopping from headquarters, and in the quality of experts. For the Tropical Forestry Action Plan, the United States expressed strong support, urging FAO to continue to strengthen its coordinating role in implementation of the plan. On FAO's assessment of and proposals for aid-in-kind to support agricultural production, the United States joined a number of other donors in opposing most follow-up actions. Except for FAO's role in providing technical advice on agricultural input needs at the field level, the proposals were not appropriate for FAO or likely to be particularly useful. The United States and most donors felt that increases in aid-in-kind would likely require trade-offs resulting in decreases in other forms of aid. Thus, assessment requirements for agricultural inputs and allocation of resources to obtain them should be part of an overall integrated planning process at the country level.

On the Code of Conduct for the Distribution and Use of Pesticides, the Conference adopted a resolution calling for the principle of prior informed consent to be incorporated into the code within the 1988-1989 biennium and requesting the Director General to establish a working group to determine how best this could be effected. The United States, along with six major donor countries, placed a reservation on this resolution on the grounds that it prejudges the need to amend the code before the working group conducts its study on prior informed consent.

Led by the Nordics with support from the United States and Canada, the Conference adopted a resolution requiring FAO to consider in the design and implementation of all projects how they will affect or involve women. The decision also required FAO to develop a plan for training FAO staff in questions related to women in development. The Conference adopted a resolution, sponsored by Mexico, on support to the Action Committee on Latin American Cooperation and Consultation on Plant Genetic Resources (CARFIT). The United States, along with nine other major donor countries, placed a reservation on this resolution on the grounds that it did not clearly identify the scope of cooperation between FAO and CARFIT, nor did it address the budget implications of such cooperation.

## OTHER MEETINGS

The 9th session of the FAO Committee on Agriculture (COAG) held its biennial meeting March 23-April 1. Meetings of the COAG primarily focus on technical agricultural issues. They provide opportunities to review and examine a wide range of FAO technical program activities, as well as the FAO Program of Work and Budget.

The U.S. Delegation attempted to move the COAG toward assigning priorities to the programs proposed in the Summary Program of Work and Budget and to lay the groundwork for reform of the FAO budgetary process, as required by the Kassebaum-Solomon amendment to the Foreign Affairs Authorization Act. There was little or no support for these U.S. efforts by other members of the COAG, who showed no inclination to eliminate low priority programs from the budget. For the first time, however, COAG's final report did contain recognition of a problem concerning priority setting. As described above, these concerns came to a head in the reform-review discussion later in the year.

## THE WORLD FOOD PROGRAM

Since its establishment in 1963, the World Food Program (WFP) has been the principal vehicle within the UN system for distributing food aid. The FAO and the United Nations jointly sponsor WFP. WFP distributes food commodities: (1) to support development projects (e.g., food-for-work projects) designed to produce social and economic progress; and (2) as emergency food assistance responding to natural and man-made disasters. Development projects make up approximately 75 percent of the total WFP program and emergency projects the remaining 25 percent.

Human resources development includes construction of schools, libraries, hospitals, etc., and improving nutrition through feeding school children and especially vulnerable groups like pregnant and nursing mothers. The most common implementation mechanism used is "food-for-work." These projects mobilize unemployed manpower for such tasks as clearing land, planting forests, or building roads. In general, the laborers are paid, at least in part, with food commodities. The majority of WFP projects involve and therefore stimulate small-scale private sector participation in support of the development process.

WFP uses food aid to serve groups affected by structural adjustment programs. WFP uses targeted feeding programs to reach population groups whose real income has declined due to adjustment policies. As food subsidies decline so does the real purchasing power of the poor. In these instances, WFP has sought those most in need of assistance as targets for food aid.

WFP's long term goal is to help developing countries to become capable of producing or purchasing their national food requirements. Within the UN system, the resources delivered by WFP are exceeded in value only by those provided by the World Bank. In 1987 WFP shipped 2,081,000 metric tons of food; provided commodities valued at $392.1 million and $107.8 million in cash, for development projects; and provided commodities valued at $151.5 million and $50.4 million in cash, for emergency projects.

The WFP received approximately $570 million in cash and commodity contributions in 1987. In terms of biennial contributions, the United States has consistently been the largest donor, and has provided some 26 percent of total contributions to WFP since it was founded. The United States provided $250 million in commodities and cash through P.L. 480 in the 1985-1986 biennium, and has pledged an equal amount for the 1987-1988 biennium. In FY 1987, the United States contributed $110 million to WFP for regular development projects in cash and commodities; and 204,000 metric tons of commodities, worth $39 million, to the International Emergency Food Reserve. WFP is the prime vehicle for U.S. multilateral food assistance efforts and is both a complement and supplement to our own bilateral efforts. Other large donors in 1987, included Canada, with contributions totaling $114.1 million in cash and commodities, the EEC, with contributions totaling $69.9 million, and Australia, with contributions totaling $30.3 million.

## THE COMMITTEE ON FOOD AID POLICIES AND PROGRAMS (CFA)

The Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programs (CFA) is the governing body of WFP. The CFA is composed of 30 members, elected for 3-year terms, with 10 members elected annually. ECOSOC elects half of these, and the FAO Council elects the remaining five. The United States and some other major donors are regularly reelected to the CFA. At the November 1986 meeting of the FAO Council, the United States was reelected to the CFA for a term beginning January 1, 1987.

The CFA meets twice a year to review WFP projects and resource commitments and to discuss WFP program and budgetary issues. WFP operates on a 2-year cycle for budgeting, programming, and planning purposes. Donors pledge resources to WFP on a biennial basis. In 1987 for the 13th biennium (1989-1990), WFP established a pledge target of $405 million in cash and 3.25 million tons of food, making the total cash value of the pledge target $1.4 billion. Members contribute in cash or commodities, or both. (The United States did not announce in 1987 its pledge for the 13th biennium.)The 23rd session of the CFA met in Rome from May 25 to June 4. At the opening of the 23rd session, a member of the U.S. Delegation, was elected to be Second Vice Chairman for the 23rd and 24th CFA. The agenda included approval of 18 projects valued at $265 million, and discussion of the role of food aid in structural and sectoral adjustment and the management of funds generated by food-assisted projects. Many delegations, including the United States, expressed reluctance to discuss such issues prior to consideration of policy guidelines for monetization (i.e., commercial sale) of food aid, scheduled for the fall CFA.

WFP Executive Director James C. Ingram announced the appointment of an informal expert group of eight persons to report to the fall CFA about how the CFA could improve the efficiency of its project approval process. The "group of eight" was made up of individuals from both recipient and donor countries, including the United States. The Executive Director, in seeking to implement certain recommendations of the 1986 McKinsie Report on management of WFP, requested additional budgetary resources to pay for the increases in personnel that were projected. These proposed staffing and organizational changes, including the creation of a new post, Director of Operations, which was filled by an American, were necessary to raise the quality of design and implementation of WFP projects. The CFA approved the Executive Director's request for additional resources.

During the 24th session of the CFA, which was held October 20-31, 15 projects valued at $256 million were approved. The U.S. delegation noted improvements in the project cycle and proposed bringing general observations or issues from the project reviews back to the CFA.

The question of the monetization of food aid was thoroughly discussed by the 24th CFA. The WFP Secretariat recognized the desire of the United States and other large donors that the monetized component of projects be strictly limited. The CFA recognized that WFP must respond to the specific needs of all low-income countries, particularly those heavily dependent on food imports, and that it must target its activities primarily on the poor. In certain cases, the direct distribution of food might not be possible, but the benefits of monetization should be targeted on the poor. WFP explicitly committed itself not to exceed the historic norm of 15 percent monetization of projects.

During debate on Emergency Operations, the U.S. Delegation introduced a statement on the food shortage situation in the Horn of Africa and appealed to all to respond to this crisis while there was still time to act in advance of a tragic situation of the type which developed in 1984-1985. The United States expressed the hope that action would be taken in time so that people would be fed in their villages, rather than suffering the stress of congregating in camps. The United States congratulated the FAO for the successful operation of its early warning system, which forecasted this emergency, and called for WFP and donors to take initiatives on pledges of assistance to combat the emergency.

Concerning the "group of eight" report to the CFA, the U.S. delegation joined the majority in support of adopting, on an experimental basis, the group's recommendations regarding the CFA project approval process. In view of vehement reservations expressed by a minority of delegations, however, it was decided to withhold decision on the group's proposals until the 25th CFA.

The Executive Director, James Ingram, an Australian, was reappointed to a second 5-year term beginning April 1, 1987.

## UN Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)

The United States continued to hold observer status with UNESCO during 1987. The U.S. Observer Mission promotes residual U.S. interests at UNESCO and works with Secretariat officials and diplomats accredited to UNESCO to encourage reform within the Organization. During 1987 the U.S. Observer attended all sessions of UNESCO's governing bodies, including the 24th General Conference, and participated in the work of the Paris-based Western Information Group, the Western Electoral Group, and the Geneva Group.

The mandate of the Reform Observation Panel (ROP) for UNESCO was extended in March 1987 for 1 year. The Panel was established by the Secretary of State in 1985 "to assess and report on the UNESCO reform process and to encourage reform efforts that advance continuing U.S. interests." Mr. Leonard Marks serves as Chairman. The Panel met once during 1987 and its chairman or members observed parts of the Spring (126th) and Fall (127th) sessions of the Executive Board and the 24th session of the General Conference (October-November). The Panel did not identify reforms sufficient to warrant a review of the U.S. decision to withdraw from UNESCO.

During the Fall session of the Executive Board, (October, 1987), Federico Mayor was nominated for the post of Director General. Although the nomination process was vigorously contested, Mayor was elected Director General by a massive majority (147 to 7 with 2 abstentions) at the 24th session of the General Conference. The new Director General announced his intention to undertake budgetary, management, and programmatic reform.

During 1987 the United States remained a party to the following UNESCO-related international conventions:

— The Agreement for Facilitating the International Circulation of Visual and Auditory Materials of an Educational, Scientific, and Cultural character, with Protocol (Beirut Agreement), done at Lake Success, July 15, 1949;

— The Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials, with Protocol, (Florence Agreement), done at Lake Success, November 22, 1950;

— The Universal Copyright Convention and Protocols 1, 2, and 3 Annexed thereto, done at Geneva, September 6, 1952;

— The Convention Concerning the Exchange of Official Publications and Government Documents between States, adopted at Paris, December 3, 1958;

— The Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Ilicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property, adopted by the UNESCO General Conference at its 16th Session on November 14, 1970;

— The Universal Copyright Convention as revised at Paris on July 24, 1971, and Protocols 1 and 2 Annexed thereto, adopted on July 14, 1971, by an International Conference of States Convened by UNESCO;

— The Convention for the Protection of Producers of Phonograms Against Unauthorized Duplication of their Phonograms done at Geneva, October 29, 1971; and

— The Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage done at Paris, November 16, 1972.

The United States also participated in the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) and the International Geological Correlation Program (IGCP). The regulations governing these UNESCO-related bodies allow participation of non-UNESCO member states.

The United States made voluntary contributions, through the International Convention and Scientific Organizations Account, of approximately $2 million dollars to these intergovernmental bodies as well as to selected international scientific or cultural activities in UNESCO's fields of competence considered important to U.S. interests. In the past, financing for these purposes was provided by U.S. annual contributions to UNESCO. Among other bodies or activities funded were the Man and the Biosphere Program, and international activities in library and information science. A separate contribution was made to the World Heritage Fund.

## UNESCO CONVENTION ON THE MEANS OF PROHIBITING AND PREVENTING THE ILLICIT IMPORT, EXPORT, AND TRANSFER OF OWNERSHIP OF CULTURAL PROPERTY

During 1987 the United States took its first action under the 1970 UNESCO Convention on the means of prohibiting and preventing the illicit import, export, and transfer of ownership of cultural property. In March 1987 the Government of El Salvador evoked Article 9 of the Convention and asked the U.S. Government, as a country with a major market for Pre-Columbian art, to assist it in curbing the looting of archaeological sites in El Salvador's Cara Sucia region. The region, of high cultural significance, represents three millenia of Pre-Hispanic occupation and yields some of the earliest known Mesoamerican pottery. The region, located in the southwestern corner of El Salvador, has been subjected to extensive looting; this has prevented archaeologists from systematically excavating the region.

El Salvador's request was reviewed by the President's Cultural Property Advisory Committee, which unanimously recommended that emergency import restrictions be imposed. On September 11, 1987, the U.S. Government imposed emergency import restrictions on artifacts from the Cara Sucia region for a period of 5 years. Such material is now prohibited entry into the United States unless accompanied by an export certificate issued by the Government of El Salvador.

U.S. actions under this Convention are authorized by the Convention on Cultural Property Implementation Act (PL 97-446). Under Executive Order 12555, March 10, 1986, the President delegated most of his decision-making and reporting functions to the Director of the U.S. Information Agency. The Secretary of State was delegated the authority to negotiate bilateral and multilateral agreements under the Act. Enforcement is the responsibility of U.S. Commissioner of Customs. In those territories outside Customs jurisdiction, enforcement is the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior.

## UNIVERSAL COPYRIGHT CONVENTION

The International Copyright activities of UNESCO, conducted primarily in association with the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), addressed a variety of issues of importance to American copyright interests.

In April 1987 a committee of governmental experts met at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris to discuss the various copyright and neighboring rights issues related to dramatic, choreographic, and musical works.

A committee of governmental experts met at WIPO Headquarters in Geneva in October to review the state of international and national protection for works of applied art (that is, designs of industrial articles).

UNESCO/WIPO also convened a committee of governmental experts in Geneva at the end of November to discuss copyright and neighboring rights issues arising in relation to the printed word. These included: (1) the fight against copyright piracy of the printed word; (2) public lending rights; (3) translation rights; (4) reprographic reproduction; (5) storage in and retrieval from computer systems of protected works; (6) electronic publishing and electronic libraries; and, (7) copyright problems associated with the protection of data bases.

At each of the above WIPO/UNESCO meetings, the experts met with a view to arriving at certain "principles." Although the "principles" have no binding force, taken together with comments from the meetings, they will provide guidance to governments dealing with these issues.

## INTERGOVERNMENTAL OCEANOGRAPHIC COMMISSION

The United States, as a member state of the 115 member Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC), continues its active participation as a member of the IOC Executive Council. In 1987 our financial contribution of $500,000 helped support a number of international program activities considered to be of priority interest to U.S. marine science. The U.S. delegation to the 14th session of the General Assembly was led by Dr. Anthony Calio, Under Secretary for the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and U.S. Representative to the IOC. During the Assembly, the United States was reelected to the Executive Council.

Strong leadership in IOC subsidiary bodies is also maintained by U.S. national coordinators for IOC programs through the Interagency Panel for International Programs and Intergovernmental Cooperation in Ocean Affairs (PIPICO). In 1987 U.S. delegations participated in a number of meetings, workshops, and symposia sponsored by the IOC to address the planning and coordination of global and regional scientific programs of importance to American scientists. These include the World Ocean Circulation Experiment (WOCE), Tropical Oceans and Global Atmosphere (TOGA) Experiment, International Oceanographic Data Exchange (IODE), Global Investigation of Pollution in the Marine Environment (GIPME), International Recruitment Experiment (IREX), Integrated Global Ocean Services System (IGOSS), Global Sea-Level Observing System (GLOSS), Subcommission for the Caribbean and Adjacent Regions (IOCARIBE), Regional Committee for the Western Pacific (WESTPAC), and the IOC Consultative Group on Ocean Mapping.

## INTERNATIONAL GEOLOGICAL CORRELATION PROGRAM

The International Geological Correlation Program (IGCP) is a cooperative enterprise by the International Union of Geological Sciences (IUGS) and UNESCO, with governmental participation, designed to encourage international research on geological problems related to the identification and assessment of natural resources and the improvement of man's environment. Since it was initiated in May 1973, the program has grown in size and scope. There are currently 51 active projects, of which 45 are funded and 6 are on "extended term" status (not funded, but listed and results reported).

The IGCP Scientific Committee is composed of 17 members including the United States. The United States also holds one of the 15 seats on the IGCP Board. The Scientific Committee reviews the scientific objectives and performance of the IGCP projects, and the Board approves and oversees the total IGCP program. It was funded at a level of $251,000 for 1987 by UNESCO and IUGS.

IGCP project activities in the United States are guided and coordinated by the U.S. National Committee for IGCP, organized in 1974 as a subcommittee of the U.S. National Committee on Geology. The USNC/IGCP screens proposals from U.S. scientists for new projects, conducts in-depth scientific reviews of ongoing projects, issues periodic newsletters and reports, and solicits and allocates funds to support U.S. project working group activities. The USNC/IGCP was funded by the National Science Foundation at a level of $64,000 for 1987. The U.S. Geological Survey provides travel funds and administrative support for the Committee's meetings.

The focus of IGCP affairs in the United States is the project working group. Twenty-eight working groups, each consisting of 3 to 10 or more scientists, have been organized. The most recent IGCP projects usually have had leaders in developing countries. This has given U.S. scientists the opportunity to initiate geological investigations in areas that were previously not accessible because of lack of scientific counterparts. In 1987, 9 publications were completed (17 are in process) and 17 meetings and workshops were held.

As an example, Project 156, Phosphorites, has been one of the most active IGCP projects for the last several years. The purpose of the project is to stimulate scientific research on questions ranging from the formation of phosphorites to changes in the global phosphorus cycle and to provide training in the area of sedimentary phosphorites. American scientists organized the 10th International IGCP field workshop and symposium on the "Genesis of Tethyan Phosphorites and Associated Petroleum Source Rocks," which was held in Tunisia, September-October 1987. The meeting brought together 69 phosphate experts and geologists from 18 countries to review the known phosphate geology of the Tethyan region. With the Australian Bureau of Mineral Resources, the project is coorganizing a major interdisciplinary phosphate research study in Australia.

American scientists also organized an international conference on "Tectonothermal Evolution of the West African Orogens" in Nouakchott, Mauritania. Several publications resulting from the project are in process.

## MAN AND THE BIOSPHERE PROGRAM

During 1987 U.S. scientists, as individuals and as members of the United States Man and the Biosphere Program (MAB), continued to collaborate with the UNESCO MAB program and with other programs and agencies of the United Nations.

Funds that the Department of State contributed from the voluntary contributions section of the Foreign Assistance Act were granted to MAB to support U.S. scientists who would provide high caliber leadership and guidance to the UNESCO MAB Secretariat; to support a series of international research projects and symposia; and to subsidize the joint publication of special issues of an international scientific journal as well as the proceedings of conferences that were organized in cooperation with U.S. MAB and several UN agencies.

The U.S. scientists organized three workshops which were cosponsored by U.S. MAB, UNESCO MAB, the Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment (SCOPE) of the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU), and the International Union of Biological Sciences (IUBS). One workshop concerned "Geosphere-Biosphere Observatories: Their Definition and Design for Studying Global Change"; a second was titled "New Perspectives on Landscape Boundaries"; and the third focused on "Land/Inland Water Ecotones: Strategies for Research and Management."

These workshops were successful in producing specific collaborative international research plans, and their reports were published as special issues of *Biology International*, the news magazine of the International Union of Biological Sciences. These U.S. scientists were subsequently invited to present summary papers at global organizing conferences on the International Geosphere-Biosphere Program (IGBP) to the Executive Committee of SCOPE. As a result of this U.S. leadership, the IGBP will cooperate closely with UNESCO in establishing global transects to monitor global environmental change, and SCOPE has adopted "ecotones in a changing environment; the theory and management of landscape boundaries," as a major international project for the next 3 years.

The UNESCO MAB-based U.S. scientists also played significant roles in assisting the UNESCO MAB Secretariat to give priority attention to the development of a research agenda for the Northern Science Network. The U.S. and UNESCO MAB Programs collaborated on the Department of State's publication of the proceedings of a Northern Science Network conference on Arctic Science Policy and Development. Finally, these U.S. scientists led the UNESCO MAB Secretariat in the process of establishing peer review mechanisms to review proposed international research projects for UNESCO MAB sponsorship.

In 1987 the U.S. MAB Program published the proceedings of an international conference in Puerto Rico on "Sustainable Development and Environmental Management of Small Islands," which was cosponsored by the UN Environment Program (UNEP), the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), UNESCO MAB, U.S. MAB, Canada MAB, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. U.S. MAB, with support of allocations from the Foreign Assistance Act, also joined with the UN Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) to grant support to a workshop on the Development of Marine Protected Areas and Resources in the Caribbean.

The U.S. and UNESCO MAB Programs collaborated to sponsor an international MAB project in the People's Republic of China on "Comparative Process Measurements, Modeling, and Applications Synthesis on U.S. and PRC Broadleaf Biosphere Reserves." The MAB Program also collaborated to assist the China MAB program in carrying out a Workshop on Research in Forest Hydrology in China and supported the attendance of experts from U.S. academia and federal agencies.

U.S. and UNESCO MAB, along with the UN Environmental Program, assisted in providing core support in 1987 for the Fourth World Wilderness Congress and two of its major subprograms held in Estes Park, Colorado: the Symposium on Biosphere Reserves and the Ocean Wilderness Seminar.

## WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

In October 1987 the United States was elected, by more votes than any other country, to the World Heritage Committee (the 21-member governing body of the Convention Concerning Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage) during the 6th General Assembly of States Parties. The Convention has over 100 signatories and is the largest international body working to protect mankind's natural and cultural heritage. The Committee added 41 sites to the World Heritage List at its 11th session held in December. Monticello/University of Virginia, Chaco Culture, and Hawaii Volcanoes National Parks were three new U.S. sites inscribed. At the same meeting, the United States submitted Taos Pueblo for Committee consideration in 1988. The United States announced a voluntary contribution of $219,000 to the World Heritage Fund for 1987. A U.S. initiative came to fruition in 1987 when the Committee approved implementation of a test monitoring system for early threats to designated properties.

## U.S. NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR UNESCO

The membership of all Commissioners expired at the end of 1985. Given the U.S. withdrawal from UNESCO, there has been no Commission activity since then.

## Vorld Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)

The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) was established y a convention signed at Stockholm in 1967 which entered into force on April 6, 1970. The United States is a party to the Convention which has 116 nember states. WIPO is the principal worldwide organization responsible for romoting the protection of intellectual property which comprises two lements: copyrights (mainly literary and artistic works) and industrial roperty (mainly patents on inventions, trademarks, and industrial designs). VIPO is also responsible for the administration of some 15 intergovernmental Jnions," each founded on a multilateral treaty. The two principal treaties are ne 1883 Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, which has 7 parties, and the 1886 Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and rtistic Works, which has 76 parties. The United States is a party to the ormer Convention but not the latter, although the President has requested the dvice and consent of the Senate to adhere to the Berne Convention.

### DMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

The Paris and Berne Conventions had provided for an international ureau to serve as Secretariat for each respective Union. These were united in 393, eventually under the name of the United International Bureaux for the rotection of Intellectual Property (BIRPI). Although BIRPI still has a legal xistence for states that are members of one of the Unions but not of WIPO, in ractice it has been supplanted by the International Bureau established by the ockholm Convention to be the Secretariat of WIPO. WIPO became a pecialized agency of the United Nations in 1974.

WIPO's Coordination Committee meets annually and is entrusted with e normal tasks of such a governing body, especially the implementation of e biennial program and budget of WIPO. As a member of the Paris Union xecutive Committee, the United States continued as a member of the WIPO oordination Committee through 1987. During 1987 the United States was so a member of the following governing bodies of other organs of WIPO: the eneral Assembly, the Budget Committee, the Permanent Committee for evelopment Cooperation Related to Copyrights and Neighboring Rights, the rmanent Committee on Industrial Property Information, and the Permanent ommittee for Development Cooperation related to Industrial Property.

The 1986-1987 biennial budget of WIPO was adopted by the governing dies in September 1985. The amount of the gross assessed budget (for the ogram Unions) is 47,128,000 Swiss Francs. The United States did not join in e consensus because the budget contained program growth and nacceptable cost increases. The United States is assessed approximately 3.9% the total assessments.

One of two basic objectives of WIPO is to promote the protection of intellectual property on a worldwide basis. In support of this objective, WIPO encourages the conclusion of new international treaties and the harmonization of national laws; it gives legal-technical assistance to developing countries; it assembles and disseminates information on intellectual property; it maintains international registration services in the fields of trademarks, industrial designs, and appellations of origin; and it performs the administrative tasks for an international patent filing arrangement.

The second basic objective of WIPO is to ensure administrative cooperation among the Unions. Centralizing the administration of the various Unions in the International Bureau helps ensure economy both for the member states and for the private sector concerned with intellectual property.

## TECHNICAL ACTIVITIES

The Permanent Committee for Patent Information, established in 1977, was renamed the Permanent Committee for Industrial Property Information. It continues to coordinate all technical activities in regard to international patent classification and cooperation.

## ASSISTANCE TO DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Activities of WIPO in the field of development cooperation with respect to developing countries continued in 1987 under the direction of two committees composed of developed and developing countries, the WIPO Permanent Committee for Development Cooperation Related to Copyrights and Neighboring Rights, and the WIPO Permanent Committee for Development Cooperation Related to Industrial Property. The United States participates in both of these committees and supports most of the activities which were numerous and varied.

During 1987 WIPO continued to provide traineeships to officials from developing countries in the fields of industrial property and copyright. The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office participated by providing training to a number of developing country nationals in the industrial property field.

## REVISION OF THE PARIS CONVENTION

The United States continued its active participation in the revision of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, the most important multilateral treaty in this field. Four sessions of the Diplomatic Conference, held from 1980 to 1984 failed to resolve questions concerning a voting procedure for adoption of a revision (the United States prefers unanimous consent), issues relating to sanctions for not working a patent in a given country, and trademark issues concerning the use of geographical names to identify products. The Assembly of the Paris Union decided that consultations aimed at improving the prospects for positive results should orecede a fifth session of the Diplomatic Conference. Consultative meetings vere held in June 1985 and January 1987.

### ATENT COOPERATION TREATY

A total of 40 countries have ratified or adhered to the Patent Cooperation 'reaty (PCT). Under the PCT, U.S. citizens and residents may file an nternational patent application with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office in Vashington. The effect of the international application is the same as if ational applications had been concurrently filed with national Patent Offices ncluding the European Patent Office) of those countries party to the PCT hich the applicant designates. The international application is then ubjected to a search of a prior art by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, nd the applicant then decides, on the basis of the international search report, hether it is worthwhile to pursue applications in the various countries esignated. National procedures in such countries are delayed until 20 nonths after the priority date, unless the applicant asks for an earlier start.

### RUSSELS SATELLITE CONVENTION

On March 7, 1985, the United States became a party to the Convention elating to the Distribution of Program-Carrying Signals Transmitted by atellite (Brussels Satellite Convention). This Convention provides for the bligation of each contracting State to take adequate and effective measures to revent the unauthorized distribution on or from its territory of any program-arrying signal transmitted by a satellite. Although there were only 11 ountries party to this Convention at the end of 1987, it is a most important onvention with respect to piracy of satellite television signals. The United ates is encouraging other countries to join the Brussels Convention.

## Vorld Health Organization (WHO)

The World Health Organization (WHO) in 1987 put special emphasis on oordination of the global attack on the pandemic of acquired immune eficiency syndrome (AIDS), while continuing its work toward the goal of ealth for all by the year 2000." Much attention during the year focused on e shortfall in U.S. Government payment of assessments to WHO.

### .S. PARTICIPATION

The United States maintained its role as one of the most active of the 166 ember states. U.S. Delegations took leading positions on many issues at the nual World Health Assembly, and U.S. Government agencies continued to pply many technical consultants and advisors to WHO to assist with its ork in numerous substantive health fields.

The U.S. Delegation to the 40th World Health Assembly, held in Geneva on May 4-16, was headed by Donald Newman, Under Secretary of Health and Human Services. The Delegation included Dr. C. Everett Koop, Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service; Joseph C. Petrone, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations office in Geneva; Dr. Robert Windom, DHHS Assistant Secretary for Health; Dr. Frank E. Young, Commissioner of Food and Drugs; Dr. Howard A. Minners, Science Advisor of the U.S. Agency for International Development; and Neil A. Boyer, Director for Health and Transportation Programs in the Bureau of International Organization Affairs, U.S. Department of State.

Under Secretary Newman, speaking before a full Assembly hall in the general debate, addressed a number of specific WHO issues. He also noted that the National Institutes of Health of the United States was celebrating its 100th anniversary in 1987, and pointed out that NIH had become one of the world's leading institutions in addressing health problems through medical research.

From January 12 to 23, the United States sent a delegation to the annual business meeting of the WHO Executive Board, in part to review proposals for the 1988-89 program budget that the Assembly would adopt in May. The delegation was headed by Dr. Young, the U.S. member of the Board. Dr. Young also headed U.S. delegations to a 2-day reorganizational meeting of the Board following the Assembly, on May 18-19, and to a meeting of the Board's Program Committee, from June 29 to July 2, for discussions of potential improvements in the management of WHO resources and the establishment of a ceiling for the 1990-1991 program budget.

At the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO), which also serves as the WHO regional office for the Americas, the United States sent a delegation to the 32nd meeting of the Directing Council, consisting of senior officials from all 37 member countries. The meeting was held in Washington on September 21-25. U.S. delegations also attended meetings of the nine-member Executive Committee on June 22-26 and September 25, as well as meetings of the PAHO Subcommittee on Planning and Programming on April 1-3 and December 7-9.

The United States sent a delegation to the 38th meeting of the WHO regional committee for the Western Pacific, held in Beijing, China, on September 8-14, and an observer delegation to the annual meeting of the regional committee for Europe, held in Bruges, Belgium, on September 14-19. A delegation also was sent to the 28th meeting of the Governing Council of WHO's International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), held on April 29-30, in Lyon, France.

## HEALTH ISSUES

The World Health Assembly in May gave extensive treatment to pressing health issues, including AIDS, health care financing, and diarrheal diseases.

## DS

DHHS Under Secretary Newman praised WHO in his general debate ech for its work on AIDS. He pledged the continued cooperation of the . Government in that effort and to assign a consultant to WHO to help plan rk on the linkage between intravenous drug abuse and AIDS.

Almost all of the countries represented contributed to the long nmittee debate on AIDS. Surgeon General Koop congratulated WHO ector General Halfdan Mahler (Denmark) and AIDS program director athan Mann (U.S.) for their perceptive action. "Mankind," he said, "is at the inning of what could be a global pandemic of historic proportions. . . . at is required to meet the enormous and complex challenge to global lth and development is an unprecedented level of aggressive, global rvention by WHO. The centralized action that made smallpox eradication ality would be a useful model for preparing a plan of attack. Control of epidemic is an urgent public health challenge and one which is far more icult and complex than any other that the world's public health community ever undertaken."

At the Executive Board meeting in January, Dr. Robert C. Gallo, Chief of Laboratory of Tumor Cell Biology of the National Cancer Institute, was ted to make a presentation of his work in identifying the virus associated the disease AIDS. During the Assembly in May, Director General Mahler vened a special informal meeting during the Assembly to brief delegates he facts of the disease and the WHO reaction to it.

The resolution on AIDS adopted by the Assembly endorsed the global tegy and program structure prepared by WHO. Reflecting concern about neous published reports and other forms of "disinformation" that had gested AIDS had been developed in a U.S. laboratory, the resolution also rred to AIDS as a "disease caused by one or more naturally occurring oviruses of undetermined geographical origin." Soviet delegates joined the sensus on the resolution that included this point.

During 1987 the United States was a major supporter of the WHO AIDS gram. Through resources of the U.S. Agency for International elopment, the United States contributed $5 million directly to WHO and, oordination with WHO, supported AIDS programs in developing nations $9 million in technical assistance and with condoms valued at another $3 ion.

### rmaceuticals

In September 1987, WHO Director General Mahler convened a press erence at the U.S. Capitol to provide a forum for the announcement by ck and Company, a U.S. manufacturer, that it would make available, out charge, millions of doses of the drug ivermectin, which had appeared as the first effective treatment for onchocerciasis, or "river blindness." Dr. Mahler called the disease an untreatable "scourge of humanity since recorded history." The company announced that, in order to ensure the distribution of the drug was adequately monitored, Merck and WHO would create an independent committee of public health specialists to review requests for the drug.

Meanwhile, WHO, U.S. AID, the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, and private-sector researchers continued efforts to develop an effective vaccine against malaria. U.S. AID said it had spent in excess of $70 million over a 10-year period to assist in development of the vaccine. By 1987 prototype vaccine candidates had been tested in human volunteers in the United States, providing partial protection. When finally available, the vaccine was expected to have a revolutionary impact on health conditions in developing nations.

On other pharmaceutical topics, the World Health Assembly adopted a resolution on traditional medicine calling for member states to expand research into traditional ways of treating ailments and asking them to ensure quality control of drugs derived from traditional remedies. Another resolution asked members states to review the registration of medicines containing alcohol as an active ingredient, with a view to reducing its use as much as feasible, especially where it could be replaced by a non-alcoholic substance. Governing bodies of WHO adopted no other resolutions on pharmaceutical products during 1987.

**Smoking**

After an extensive discussion on the negative effects of smoking on health, the World Health Assembly adopted a resolution declaring April 7, 1988, the 40th anniversary of WHO, as "World No Tobacco Day." The resolution encouraged governments and nongovernmental organizations to "launch or strengthen existing anti-smoking campaigns and health-promoting initiatives." It also appealed to tobacco manufacturers to refrain voluntarily on this day from all publicity activities in all countries, but especially in developing nations, and asked the press and other media voluntarily to do the same.

In the course of the year, WHO headquarters and regional offices announced a policy of no smoking on their premises. In a ceremony at WHO headquarters, before television cameras, Director General Mahler ceremoniously smashed an ashtray with a hammer. WHO said its smoking ban was intended to act as an example to schools, factories, government and business premises and hospitals, as well as to other international organizations.

### ealth Care Financing

The Assembly set aside 2 days for "technical discussions" on the subject " "economic support for national health-for-all strategies." An Assembly solution, among other things, asked member states to review their patterns resource allocation in the health sector and to reorient, as appropriate, their ending priorities, including the giving of additional resources to primary alth care, to prevention, and to the underserved and the neediest segments the population. U.S. AID officials played a major role in planning and ancing participation in the discussions and in the drafting of the ultimate solution, which included a call for the greater involvement of the private ctor and community-based agencies in health development.

### iarrheal Diseases

After an extensive discussion of the means of dealing with diarrheal seases, the Assembly adopted a resolution reaffirming the need for ministration of oral rehydration fluid and for appropriate feeding during d after diarrhea. To prevent diarrheal diseases, the Assembly endorsed a licy covering improved nutrition, promotion of breastfeeding and better eaning practices, increased access to and use of safe water, better personal giene, improved sanitation, and immunization against measles. The U.S. legation spoke in strong support of the WHO program to control diarrheal seases.

### lvancing Health for All

In support of its overall goal of ensuring "health for all by the year 2000," Assembly adopted a new 6-year medium term plan, its 8th General ogram of Work, covering the period 1990-1995. The secretariat was quested to develop three biennial program budgets based upon the nciples of this document. The 8th General Program of Work sought to ablish systems for creating priorities for attention by WHO during this riod and for improving attention to primary health care, which is the agreed sis for the WHO strategy.

### search on the Aging

The Assembly discussed health care of the elderly, particularly in the itext that attainment of the goal of "health for all" would result in the vival of increasing numbers of the world's population into old age. A olution requested the Director General to establish an international earch program on aging, as part of WHO's program on health of the erly, and to secure voluntary contributions for support of the program.

### Maternal Health

The Assembly gave special attention to the need to improve the health of women and to reduce maternal mortality and morbidity. A resolution urged member states to give high priority, among other things, to making family planning services available to all who need them in order to avoid unwanted or high-risk pregnancies. The Director General was asked to support research on safe motherhood, with emphasis on preventing the main causes of maternal mortality and on finding local solutions to overcome the obstacles to appropriate maternal care.

### Other Health Topics

In other discussions and resolutions, the Board gave attention to leprosy, human organ transplants, health manpower development, the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless, and the FAO/WHO Codex Alimentarius Commission, which sets standards for preparation and packaging of foods in international commerce.

## ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY ISSUES

### WHO Leadership

During 1987, in accordance with the WHO Constitution, Director General Mahler announced that in January 1988 the Executive Board would nominate a person to serve the next term as Director General and that the World Health Assembly in May 1988 would formally elect the Director General. Dr. Mahler, who was completing his third 5-year term, told inquirers that he was not interested in participating in an election for another term.

Considerable attention was given to the election in the course of the year. Four of the six WHO regional directors formally introduced their candidacies for election as Director General. These were Dr. Hussein Al-Gezairy of Saudi Arabia, director of the WHO Eastern Mediterranean office in Alexandria, Egypt; Dr. Hiroshi Nakajima of Japan, director of the Western Pacific office in Manila, the Philippines; Dr. Carlyle Guerra de Macedo of Brazil, director of the WHO regional office for the Americas and of the Pan American Health Organization, in Washington; and Dr. Gottlieb Monekosso, director of the African regional office in Brazzaville, the Congo. In September 1987, the United States informed other WHO member states that it supported the election of Dr. Macedo of Brazil.

### U.S. Government Payments

In formal meetings, correspondence, and informal settings, much attention was placed in 1987 on the slow payment of U.S. assessments to WHO as a result of a shortfall in appropriations for the Department of State.

t the time of the World Health Assembly in May 1987, the United States wed WHO a total of $118.2 million, including $2.6 million for 1985, $52.8 illion for 1986, and the entire $62.8 million assessment for 1987.

U.S. payments to WHO for a particular calendar year are normally made om appropriations from the U.S. Government budget that covers the period eginning on October 1 of the same year; therefore no payment could be ade on the WHO assessment for calendar 1986, for example, until at least ctober 1986. Appropriations for international organizations for Fiscal Year 987 (which includes the U.S. payment for WHO's calendar year 1986 ssessments) were not adequate to cover all U.S. Government obligations to e 46 organizations funded through the Department of State's Contributions International Organizations account, and Congress further required that a rtain amount of the appropriated resources not be spent until October 1 of 987. Because WHO was regarded as well-managed financially and not periencing severe cash-flow difficulties, as were other international rganizations, the United States paid WHO only $10 million of its 1986 sessment during 1986.

About October 1, 1987, the United States paid WHO an additional $35 illion, drawing from the deferred portion of the appropriation for calendar 986. Drawing on a series a Continuing Resolutions approved by the ongress for Fiscal Year 1988, the U.S. Government paid WHO $13 million in ctober and November against the calendar 1987 assessment, and another 2 million on December 29, leaving the year-end debt of the United States to HO at $38.1 million. The budget approved by the World Health Assembly May for 1988-1989 included an assessment for the United States of $74.7 illion for calendar 1988, officially due on January 1 of that year.

Acknowledging the shortfall in U.S. payments to WHO, DHHS Under cretary Newman told the Assembly "I want to assure you . . . that these rtial payments do not, in any way, imply a negative judgment by the nited States about WHO. We were among the founders of this organization years ago. We were partners in achieving such milestones as the adication of smallpox and the evolution of the strategy of 'health for all.' " r. Newman said that "the problem faced by WHO in relation to U.S. sessments confronts much of the UN system. WHO has not been singled t for discriminatory treatment. We believe, in fact, that WHO is leading the ay among the specialized agencies in seeking improvements in the budget ocess."

Mr. Newman also told the Assembly that WHO needed to recognize the ed to economize. The Assembly was being asked to approve a large crease in assessments at a time when many governments were having ficulty paying current dues. "As a symbolic gesture reflecting our concern er the need to reduce expenditures," he said, the U.S. Government would cline its allocation for WHO program activity in the United States and ask at the overall budget be reduced by that amount. He invited other industrialized countries to consider taking similar action.

On several occasions during the year, WHO officials wrote to U.S. Government leaders to explain the work of WHO and to detail damage being done to WHO programs because of the slow payment of U.S. assessments. Director General Mahler himself visited members of Congress to discuss the issue.

At the World Health Assembly in May, Dr. Mahler asked the delegates "What crimes has WHO committed against those who are withholding mandatory contributions? . . . That it has stimulated member states to adopt health policies in line with WHO health culture? That it has saved them more than they have ever contributed to WHO by eradicating smallpox? That WHO has taken the international lead in the battle against AIDS . . . ? Or that your Organization has displayed outstanding fiscal responsibility?"

In September Dr. Mahler wrote to Dr. Otis R. Bowen, Secretary of Health and Human Services, to say that as a result of the shortage of funds at WHO, he had had to cancel or suspend implementation of $35 million of the program approved unanimously by the World Health Assembly for the 1986-1987 biennium, and he had had to plan for reductions in the 1988-1989 biennium of $50 million in program activity. "I deeply regret that these program reductions will be severely felt by some member states most in need," he wrote, "but as I explained to the World Health Assembly, I know of no other way out of the dilemma—reducing activities or facing insolvency—which the present financial situation imposes on the Organization." In November Dr. Mahler cabled Secretary Bowen to say that the planned program reductions "have not been sufficient to make up for the even larger shortfall in U.S. contributions, and I therefore have no choice but to make additional massive program reductions if the organization is to meet its payroll and other basic financial obligations in the months to come."

In response to these and other communications from WHO, Acting Secretary of State John C. Whitehead wrote Director General Mahlerin in December to say that "I am very aware and disturbed about our payment situation in the WHO and other international organizations . . . . I can assure you of this Administration's strong support for the fine work being done by the WHO and of your outstanding leadership. I also can assure you that we will continue to work vigorously in seeking to satisfy our financial obligations to the WHO, an organization for which the United States has great respect and appreciation."

### WHO 1988-1989 Program Budget

The major financial action of 1987 was the review and approval of a program budget for 1988-1989. The secretariat proposal was submitted to the Executive Board in January and then to the World Health Assembly in May.

The Assembly spent 13 sessions, over 2 weeks, in coming to a conclusion.

The Secretariat initially had proposed an effective working budget of $636.9 million, which represented a nominal increase of 17.23 percent over the budget for 1986-1987. The proposal reflected WHO responsiveness to the concerns of major donors in that it contained negative real growth of minus 0.11 percent. However, a sharp drop in the value of the dollar by itself led to a 9.72 percent increase in the budget (the budget was calculated at a rate of 1.65 Swiss francs to the dollar, as opposed to the 2.50 rate in effect when the 1986-1987 budget was approved). Higher costs accounted for an additional 7.06 percent. Further, instead of using the full amount of available "casual income" (interest earnings and exchange rate gains from prior periods) to help finance the budget, WHO had proposed using no casual income at all. Acceptance of this situation would have led to an increase of 31.1 percent in assessments on member states.

The U.S. Delegation to the Board in January said that, in the light of difficulties that many member states were having with payment of assessments, the proposed increase was simply too great. It argued at least for the application of the full amount of the casual income available to reduce the budget. The Board agreed with U.S. proposals for a $3 million reduction in the overall budget levels but decided to recommend the use of only $25 million of casual income in the first year of the biennium, with no recommendation regarding the second year, rather than approve use of the full $47 million actually available. The Board's proposal for a $634 million budget would have required a nominal increase of 16.69 percent and an increase in assessments in 1988 of 20.45 percent.

The U.S. Delegation to the Assembly in May argued for improvements—a $50 million reduction in the level of the budget and the appropriation of the full amount of casual income in order to reduce assessments further. The Delegation pointed out that nearly one-third of the WHO membership, mostly small developing nations, had paid nothing on their 1986 assessments. Many other delegations voiced discontent with the increase in assessments. Latin American countries insisted that there be not even $1 of increase in the new budget.

Extended private negotiations led eventually to a compromise. Director General Mahlcr told the Assembly that he sympathized with their complaints about the increases, which he said were inevitable in light of exchange rate difficulties and cost increases. However, if the United States and other countries would make significant payments on their 1986 and 1987 assessments before the end of 1987, he would recommend to the Executive Board in January 1988 that the budget resolution be reopened, that the overall evel be reduced by $25 million and that the remainder of the casual income account be utilized to help finance the budget. He would also recommend a significant reduction, in real terms, in the 1990-1991 program budget in comparison with the original proposal for 1988-1989.

In the end, the Assembly approved a budget for 1988-1989 of $633,980,000, reflecting a nominal increase of 16.69 percent and utilizing $25 million in casual income for financing. In committee, the vote was 79 (U.S.) in favor, 12 (all Latin American countries) voting no, and 9 abstaining. In the plenary, the vote was 94 (U.S.) in favor, 14 opposed, and 9 abstaining. Assessments for the United States were $74,749,580 in 1988 and, if the budget were not unchanged at the 1988 Assembly, $81,127,790 in 1989. In voting yes on the budget, U.S. Delegate Neil Boyer expressed appreciation for the offer of Director General Mahler to have the budget decision reopened in 1988. He expressed the hope that a budget reduction could be achieved that was even greater than the one described by Mahler and reiterated earlier statements that the U.S. Government was working hard to restore U.S. payments to WHO.

### Budget Reform

In the course of the Executive Board meeting in January, the U.S. Delegation pushed for WHO action on reform of budget procedures that would complement the reform initiative approved by the UN General Assembly in November 1986. The result was adoption of a resolution on "cooperation in program budgeting."

> — The resolution noted that "for the foreseeable future" WHO would have zero budget growth in real terms.
>
> — It asked the WHO staff in future budgets to absorb increases from inflation and currency fluctuation to the maximum extent possible.
>
> — The Program Committee, "working in a cooperative manner aimed at achieving consensus on its recommendations," would make recommendations to the Director General regarding guidelines for development of the next biennial budget and on the global and interregional portions of each budget.
>
> — The six regional committees would seek consensus in making recommendations on the regional portions of the budget.
>
> — And the Executive Board itself would submit an overall budget proposal to the World Health Assembly, including "recommendations that are the result of a cooperative process aimed at reaching consensus."

The resolution, which did not require Assembly action, was praised by the U.S. Delegation. Department of State officials said it was likely that, once implemented, this procedure would satisfy Congressional desires that major donors be given more influence in decision-making on budgetary issues and that it would facilitate achievement of payment of full U.S. assessments to WHO in future years.

At the June meeting of the Program Committee, a consensus conclusion was reached on planning figures for the 1990-1991 budget, as the budget eform resolution had requested. The Committee recommended that a ceiling e established at $657.9 million, 3.78 percent higher in nominal terms than the udget for 1988-1989. In relation to the 1988-1989 budget, the new budget vould be reduced in real terms by $25 million, or 3.94 percent. Cost increases vould be allowed at a maximum of 10 percent at the country level, 8 percent at he regional level, and 6 percent at headquarters, for a net cost increase of 7.73 ercent. The new budget would be calculated at the same exchange rates as hose used for the 1988-1989 budget (e.g., 1.65 Swiss francs to the dollar), and xchange rate fluctuations would be handled outside the regular budget hrough a new exchange rate facility.

Throughout the year, U.S. Delegations attempted to promote measures hat would increase the involvement of member states in the setting of rogram priorities, especially in circumstances when budgets needed to be educed. U.S. Delegations also strongly supported efforts by the Director eneral to make member countries and regional offices more accountable to ne Executive Board and the Assembly regarding the use of WHO resources. egional directors generally resisted efforts from the Geneva headquarters nd the Executive Board to become more involved in program decision aking at the regional and country levels.

## OLITICAL ISSUES

The 1987 Assembly featured fewer political issues than had been present several previous years.

### ew Assembly Rules

The Executive Board proposed to the Assembly a set of rule changes that ould minimize political debate. These included a 5-minute limit on speeches the main committees, a deadline for the submission of resolutions, and the quirement of a simple majority to approve a request for a roll call vote (the rrent rule permitted a roll call vote at the request of any single member). uban and Soviet delegations argued that the new rules served to stifle the embership and obstruct free debate. After a long discussion, in which eakers were about evenly divided, Director General Mahler said he thought ere were valid points on both sides and that little was to be gained by having e issue settled via a close vote. Instead, he suggested that the Board's oposals serve as a legitimate expression of concern and that the secretariat onitor the Assembly over the ensuing 3 years to determine whether there ere in fact abuses of the current rules. The proposal was accepted.

### tion Regarding Israel

Arab states introduced a resolution relating to "health conditions in the occupied territories." Revisions of the controversial text used in previous years had eliminated several "condemnations" of Israel, but the U.S. delegation said the draft text still contained inaccurate statements and political judgments that the United States considered improper for the World Health Assembly. U.S. delegate Boyer said the changes in the resolution indicated that the cosponsors were not locked into the same old tiresome language and urged further improvements in the future, including the moving of the issue to alternate years from an annual basis and a serious attempt to develop a text that could achieve a consensus. He urged, however, that delegates vote against the 1987 proposed text.

In the committee, the resolution proposed by the Arab states was approved by a vote of 59 in favor, 17 (U.S.) opposed, and 24 abstaining. In the plenary, it was approved by a vote of 63 in favor, 26 (U.S.) opposed, and 28 abstaining.

### Health Effects of Nuclear War

The Assembly considered a long report on the subject of the "health effects of nuclear war," which it had requested (in a sharply divided vote) in 1983. Soviet and Cuban delegates introduced a resolution which called for further studies on the same subject.

The United States and other Western delegations opposed the continued use of WHO resources for this subject, especially in a time of financial constraint and growing health problems. The Soviets and Cubans were unwilling to compromise on the issue. Their resolution was adopted in committee by a vote of 59 in favor, 16 (U.S.) opposed, and 30 abstaining. In the plenary, the vote was 68 in favor, 13 (U.S.) opposed, and 28 abstaining.

### Embargoes on Medical Supplies

Libya and 29 other member states presented a draft resolution aimed at the United States and others who impose embargoes on trade with specific countries for political purposes, particularly if they serve to cut off shipments of medical supplies. Director General Mahler told the Assembly he would continue to take any step to ensure that countries that are the victims of embargoes continued to receive necessary medical supplies, and suggested that no resolution was needed.

When Libya attempted to have its resolution considered, the WHO Legal Advisor ruled that the Assembly had already rejected a separate agenda item on the same subject. After a 2-hour procedural debate, the Assembly agreed and decided not to reopen the issue.

**African Issues**

African states introduced a resolution similar to the one utilized in previous years, calling for assistance to the front-line states and to national liberation movements. The U.S. delegation again regretted the lack of an effort to achieve consensus and called for a vote. The African text was adopted in committee by a vote of 100 in favor, 1 (U.S.) opposed, and 4 abstaining. In plenary, the text was approved by a vote of 78 in favor, 1 (U.S.) opposed, and 3 abstaining.

**Chemical War**

Iran's delegation tried, as it had in previous years, to get Assembly consideration of chemical war. However, the general committee, supported by the plenary, decided to ask the Executive Board at its meeting in January to consider whether there was any useful role for WHO to play on this issue, especially in light of past experience that it was difficult to gather evidence on the subject when involved parties tried to keep the issue secret. Iran did not pursue the issue further.

## PAN AMERICAN HEALTH ORGANIZATION (PAHO)

The 32nd meeting of the 38-member PAHO Directing Council was held in Washington on September 21-25. The key item of business was the review and approval of the PAHO program budget for 1988-89. PAHO Director Macedo was praised by the United States and other delegations for his decision to hold down the budget level and to request an increase of 7.7 percent, considered by some to be an underestimate in view of inflation in the region of the Americas. PAHO staff said that more than $5 million in cost increases were being absorbed. Dr. Macedo's introduction to the budget had noted that countries were having grave financial difficulties and could not afford great increases in the assessments to international organizations.

Venezuela's delegation told the Council that it could not vote in favor of any increase at all on the budget. The final vote was 34 (U.S.) in favor, 1 opposed, and none abstaining. The effective working budget was calculated at $121,172,000 for the 2-year period. The United States, which pays 61.29 percent of the budget, was assessed $38,162,000 in each year. For 1987, the United States had been assessed $34,849,762. Because of the shortfall in appropriations for international organizations, the United States owed PAHO $11.1 million at the end of 1987, which represented 31.9 percent of the U.S. assessment.

The Council held a discussion of AIDS, which focused on what member countries were doing, one by one, in regard to education, testing, research, and reatment. The Council also heard a report on PAHO's efforts to eradicate oot-and-mouth disease in the western hemisphere. While expressing appreciation for the effort, the U.S. delegation repeated previous arguments that an excessively large proportion of the PAHO budget was being devoted to foot-and-mouth disease. It said this was a problem in view of growing human health problems and declining resources. PAHO staff acknowledged the problem but defended the allocation.

## INTERNATIONAL AGENCY FOR RESEARCH ON CANCER (IARC)

The 28th meeting of the Governing Council of IARC was held at its headquarters in Lyon, France, on April 29-30. The Council admitted Norway as its 14th member state, adopted its budget for 1988-1989.

Most of the meeting time was devoted to a review of the proposed program budget. The Secretariat said the drop in the exchange rate from 9.50 French francs to the dollar at the time of adoption of the 1986-1987 budget, to 5.95 at the time of the meeting, by itself would lead to a large increase in the new budget.

Real growth in the budget was accepted on the condition that it was attributed entirely to the initial contributions of two new members, Finland and Norway. Delegations from both countries had said there was no incentive for any country to join IARC if its contributions could not be used to increase the program activity of the organization; and they would not join if their payments were used only to reduce the assessments of other members.

The Council agreed to adopt a budget of $25.2 million for 1988-1987, with an overall increase of 45.76 percent. The increase consisted of 6.24 percent real growth, entirely attributed to the initial contributions by Finland and Norway; 3.96 percent for cost increases; and 35.56 percent for exchange rate fluctuation (the budget was calculated at a rate of 6.06 French francs to the dollar). The U.S. assessment, at 9.9 percent of the budget, was set at $851,224 in 1988 (up 31.7 percent from that of 1987), and $1,049,184 for 1989.

The U.S. Delegation supported the consensus on the new budget, but only on the condition that the Council take another look at the exchange rate at its 1988 meeting and explore the possibility at that time of lowering the budget level. Council members rejected this proposal by a vote of five in favor, five opposed, and three abstaining, and the U.S. Delegation then asked the record to show that it did not support the budget appropriation resolution. Later in 1987, the United States formally requested IARC to include the exchange rate issue on the agenda for the 1988 meeting.

Dr. Ihor J. Masnyk of the National Cancer Institute, the chief U.S. delegate, told the Council that NCI had a program of international studies focusing on cancer and human retroviruses, and it was considering expanding the program, especially in relation to AIDS, with the help of IARC. A researcher detailed by NCI to IARC or hired by IARC, he said, could focus on tumor registry studies, promote the collection of biologic materials from patients with retrovirus-associated malignancies, and facilitate epidemiologic studies of AIDS-related viruses. Dr. Tomatis said he was grateful for the NCI offer, but wanted to ask the Scientific Council to review the proposal to ensure its compatibility with other IARC programs.

## International Maritime Organization (IMO)

IMO membership consists of 131 full members and 1 associate member. Bolivia joined during 1987. Since its inception in 1958, the IMO has had its headquarters in London. The main objective of the IMO is to foster cooperation among governments on technical matters affecting international shipping to achieve the highest practicable standards of maritime safety at sea and to protect the marine environment through prevention of pollution of the sea caused by ships and other craft. The IMO also deals with legal matters concerning international shipping, and with the facilitation of international maritime traffic. It coordinates technical assistance in maritime matters to developing countries and maintains a close relationship with the World Maritime University, in Malmo, Sweden.

The IMO consists of the following organs: Assembly; Council (with an elected membership of 32); Maritime Safety Committee (MSC); Marine Environment Protection Committee (MEPC); Legal, Facilitation, and Technical Cooperation Committees; and various technical subcommittees. The Council reviews the work of the committees and refers the work to the Assembly for final approval. Plenipotentiary conferences elaborate and adopt major conventions.

### ASSEMBLY

The Assembly consists of the full membership, which meets in regular session every 2 years. The 15th session was held in November 1987. During that session, the Assembly changed the IMO's operating currency from U.S. dollars to pounds sterling, approved the 1988-1989 work plan and budget, and elected 32 members to the 1988-1989 Council (the United States was reelected). The Assembly also approved a British proposal to develop new safety regulations for ferries (because of the 1987.*Herald of Free Enterprise* ferry disaster), and adopted the report of the Assembly's Technical Committee, which manages the Global Maritime Distress and Safety System. The Assembly also decided, after some debate, not to take away the vote of countries in arrears in their annual assessments. The United States was one of those countries. The IMO Secretariat told delegates it feared that the growing problem of arrearages would cause cash-flow problems for the IMO in 1988 and future years.

### COUNCIL

The Council is responsible for all the functions of the Assembly between Assembly sessions. The Council reviews the reports of the various committees before sending them to the Assembly and develops a recommended program budget for Assembly approval. The 58th Session of the Council, which met June 15-19, prepared the way for the decisions taken by the Assembly in November.

## MARITIME SAFETY COMMITTEE (MSC)

The MSC is the IMO's senior technical committee charged with resolving technical and policy issues covering a broad range of topics. Ten technical subcommittees report to the committee. The 54th session of the MSC was held from April 27 to May 1. During the year, the MSC reviewed and encouraged implementation of the U.S.-drafted measures developed for the prevention of unlawful acts against passengers and crews on board ships (an action precipitated by the 1985 hijacking of the *Achille Lauro*, which resulted in the murder of U.S. citizen Leon Klinghoffer). Member states were also asked to inform the IMO of actions taken to implement the measures. A number of countries did so at the November session of the Assembly. It also began a review of the 1987 loss of the United Kingdom flag ferry *Herald of Free Enterprise.*

## LEGAL COMMITTEE

The Legal Committee held its 58th session October 12-16 and completed a draft revision of the 1910 Convention on Salvage and Assistance at Sea. This draft, which is scheduled for approval at a diplomatic conference in March 1989, imposed duties on salvors and shipowners to protect the environment, and amended the "no cure, no pay" doctrine by guaranteeing salvors reasonable expenses for assistance rendered to vessels threatening damage to the environment.

The Legal Committee also substantially advanced its consideration of the resolution on Cooperation in Maritime Casualty Investigation proposed by the United States and Liberia. It decided to resume priority consideration of the 1974 Athens Convention Relating to the Carriage of Passengers and their Luggage by Sea (in view of concerns raised by the *Herald of Free Enterprise* ferry disaster), and began review of the question of liability and compensation for damage caused by the maritime carriage of hazardous and noxious substances.

The Legal Committee also reviewed the work of an *Ad Hoc* preparatory committee that developed a convention on the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, based on a draft submitted by Italy, Austria, and Egypt as a result of the *Achille Lauro* hijacking. The draft treaty would create offenses, establish jurisdiction, and obligate states to prosecute or extradite alleged offenders.

Scheduled for completion at a diplomatic conference in Rome in March 1988, the treaty was to be open for signature to all countries, even those that are not members of the IMO. The United States hoped to see broad acceptance of this new anti-terrorism treaty, which in U.S. view filled a gap in international law. A related protocol covered oil rigs and platforms anchored to the continental shelf, and the people aboard them.

The second session of the IMO/UNCTAD Joint Intergovernmental Group of Experts on Maritime Liens and Mortgages met in London May 11-15. This joint group is considering revisions to existing international conventions concerning both maritime liens and mortgages and the arrest of sea-going vessels.

## MARINE ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION COMMITTEE (MEPC)

At its 24th session, held in February, the MEPC reaffirmed that any ship not in full compliance with Annex II (Regulations for the Control of Pollution by Noxious Liquid Substances in Bulk) of the 1978 Protocol to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973 (MARPOL 73/78) by the date of its entry into force (April 6, 1987) would be in violation of MARPOL 73/78. As a follow-up to this action, the committee adopted a resolution for ensuring uniform port state enforcement actions for those ships not in full compliance. The committee also unanimously approved a U.S. proposal to initiate an immersion testing program for evaluation of packages, under authority of Annex III of MARPOL 73/78. Annex III regulates pollution by harmful substances carried by sea in packaged form. Besides increasing the likelihood of ratification of Annex III by nonparties, this program was intended to ensure that Annex III substances were carried in packaging that afforded adequate protection to the marine environment while minimizing potential costs borne by the chemical, packaging, and shipping industries.

The MEPC unanimously agreed to the scope and content of the guidelines developed by the United States for the implementation of Annex V of MARPOL 73/78. The MEPC also approved all U.S.-recommended amendments to the draft guidelines for removal of offshore installations and structures in exclusive economic zones and on continental shelves. Those amendments were submitted to ensure consideration of the effects on the marine environment in relation to issues covered by the guidelines. The United States announced that it would submit a formal proposal to the 26th session of the MEPC recommending that the Gulf of Mexico be designated a Special Area under Annex V.

During the 25th session, held in December, the MEPC approved a proposal to expand the guidelines for identification of harmful substances under Annex III of MARPOL 73/78. This action was the culmination of intense negotiations by the United States at IMO and was perceived as a major victory for those seeking to enhance protection of the marine environment. The United States announced to the committee it would strongly recommend ratification of Annex III.

## International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO)

The membership of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) remained at 157 contracting states since no additional state became a party to the Convention on International Civil Aviation during 1987. On September 1, Dr. William R. Fromme of the United States became Director of the ICAO Air Navigation Bureau. He replaced Duane W. Freer, who had served in that capacity since 1979. Both men had served previously with the U.S. Federal Aviation Administration.

### SUPPRESSION OF UNLAWFUL ACTS AGAINST CIVIL AVIATION

In 1987 ICAO continued to give high priority in its work program to aviation security. From January 20–30, in response to a 1986 ICAO Assembly resolution, a legal subcommittee met to draft an instrument for the suppression of unlawful acts of violence at airports serving international civil aviation. The subcommittee, composed of experts from 18 contracting states, elected Irene E. Howie of the United States as its chairman. After considering an analytical study and draft text prepared by a rapporteur from the Netherlands, the subcommittee agreed by a large majority that the new instrument should take the form of a protocol to the 1971 Montreal Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Civil Aviation.

The protocol was next examined and refined by a meeting of the full ICAO Legal Committee, April 28–May 13. This committee, attended by representatives of 69 contracting states, then agreed that the new instrument was ready for presentation to states at a diplomatic conference. The ICAO Council decided to convene the conference at ICAO headquarters in Montreal on February 9-24, 1988.

The draft protocol would enlarge the scope of the Montreal Convention by adding to its definition of "offence" and ensure that the Convention's substantive provisions concerning jurisdiction, prosecution or extradition, and severe penalties apply to the additional offences. The additional offences encompassed unlawful acts of violence at airports serving international civil aviation that cause serious injury or death, destruction or serious damage of facilities, and disruption of services.

Further steps were taken by ICAO to protect the security of international civil aviation through the convening of the first meeting of its Aviation Security Panel. From May 19–29, representatives of 16 nations, including the United States, and observers from the International Air Transport Association (IATA), the Airport Associations Coordinating Council, and the International Federation of Airline Pilots' Associations, dealt with technical measures to suppress unlawful interference. The panel revised the ICAO Security Manual to guide states in implementing the new ICAO standards adopted in 1986 and drew up model outlines for national aviation security programs and airport security programs.

Among other problems addressed was the passenger/baggage match standard, which the ICAO Council had specified as applicable on December 19, 1987. Incomplete technical developments made complete implementation by that date difficult for some states. The French representative suggested two-phased implementation, with the December 19 date applicable only to originating and on-line transfer passengers. On December 11, the Council adopted that suggestion and added a note to the standard that gives states, if necessary, until April 1, 1989, to fully implement the standard for other then originating and on-line transfer passengers and their baggage.

## ICAO COUNCIL

The ICAO Council, the 33-member elected executive body of the Organization, which includes the United States, devoted much of its time in 1987 to ICAO's financial problems. In March, the Council requested the Secretary General to advise all contracting states of the organization's worsening financial situation due to inadequate payment of assessments by many countries, including the United States. The Secretary General then made a special appeal to states to pay their assessments if they had not already done so. The United States had been assessed $7.5 million for 1986 and $7.2 million for 1987. In April 1987, the United States was responsible for $10.7 million of the $26.6 million owed to ICAO by all member states. At the end of 1987, the United States owed $7.9 million of the $14 million in outstanding contributions.

Because of the difficulties with payments, as 1987 progressed, it became obvious that ICAO's budgeted expenditures would exceed income. The Council adopted a financial contingency plan aimed at balancing income and expenditure and still carrying out ICAO's major objectives. The Council also approved the following economies: (1) a hiring freeze so that posts in the Secretariat were not refilled when vacated; (2) a reduction in the number and duration of meetings and related secretariat services; (3) reduced travel by Secretariat personnel on official business; (4) reduced commercial communications at the headquarters and the seven regional offices; and (5) curtailed publication services.

In accordance with a 1986 ICAO Assembly resolution sponsored by the United States, the Council continued to focus in 1987 on the role that ICAO could play in suppression of illicit transport of narcotic drugs by air. In December the Council requested the Air Navigation Commission to reevaluate whether the current regulatory provisions in the appropriate ICAO annexes were sufficient to ensure that flight crews and air traffic controllers were free of drug abuse habits, not only at the time of their periodic medical assessments, but also in any situation and on any particular flight. It also requested a study of whether an accident investigation should address the same question. The

Secretary General appointed a task force composed of senior ICAO officials to coordinate the secretariat's work on drugs and to approve the preparation of comprehensive ICAO guidance to contracting states on prevention and suppression of drug abuse in international civil aviation and illicit transport of drugs.

In March the Council adopted several amendments to ICAO Annexes, as recommended by the Air Navigation Commission. Changes to the Aeronautical Information Services Annex included requirements for observing and reporting of low level wind sheer, and conversion on October 25 to a new common (ICAO/IATA) three-letter designator system for aircraft operators and aeronautical authorities and services. The conversion to a new designator system for use in transmitting operational messages became necessary due to the depletion of available ICAO two-letter designators. Since airlines continue to use their IATA-assigned two-letter designators for commercial purposes, the conversion normally is not noticeable by the public with respect to tickets, boarding passes, baggage tags, and display systems at airports.

### ICAO PANELS

Much of the technical work of ICAO is accomplished through meetings of specialized panels, consisting of qualified experts designated by a limited number of contracting states. The All Weather Operations Panel, which met from November 9–27, fulfilled the U.S. objective of ensuring that the necessary ICAO standards, criteria, and procedures would be adopted for timely international introduction of the Microwave Landing System (MLS). The panel adopted material on basic MLS procedures in technical and operational areas for inclusion in ICAO documents.

The Statistics Panel met on November 2 to 6 to review ICAO's statistical activities in preparation for a worldwide Statistics Division meeting in 1989. The Panel concluded that both of ICAO's traffic flow statistics programs should continue. On-flight origin and destination (OFOD) data reporting by States is to continue on a city pair basis, since it was decided that country pair and region pair reporting were not viable alternatives. Traffic by flight stage data are to be reported on an annual basis only. ICAO statistics are helpful to the United States in providing background data for aviation economic analysis and a global perspective of civil aviation.

Also meeting in 1987 were the Secondary Surveillance Radar (SSR) Improvements and Collision Avoidance System Panel, the Visual Aids Panel, and the Dangerous Goods Panel. All panels met at ICAO headquarters in Montreal and included representatives of the United States.

## International Telecommunication Union (ITU)

The International Telecommunication Union (ITU) held the 42nd session of its Administrative Council in Geneva, June 15–26. The Council adopted a budget for 1988 which was one percent smaller than that of 1987, a development the United States strongly supported.

U.S. objectives were also advanced at the two major World Administrative Radio Conferences (WARCs) convened in 1987. The High Frequency Broadcasting Conference (February-March) agreed to further development of the procedures for planning the use of frequencies and later consideration of changes in spectrum allocation, which would expand the number of short-wave broadcasting channels. These changes would be of direct benefit to Voice of America, Radio Liberty, and Radio Free Europe. The Conference adopted a U.S.-sponsored resolution to continue the ITU's monitoring of harmful interference (jamming) by countries of other nations' international radio broadcasts.

The WARC for Mobile Satellite Services (September-October) adopted a U.S.-supported Global Maritime Distress and Safety System (GMDSS) to improve communications for safety and rescue operations at sea. The U.S. delegation obtained spectrum allocation for Radiodetermination Satellite Service (RDSS) in North America, with the possibility of later global expansion. This service allows precise location tracking of transport vehicles, lone mountain climbers, or any moving correspondent on land. A limited spectrum allocation was also provided for the new Mobile Satellite Services (voice and other telecommunications with moving parties at long distances). This was regarded as a first step in gaining worldwide acceptance of this innovative concept.

The ITU's major Telecom trade exhibit, held in October in Geneva, generated substantial additional revenues (estimated at 500,000 Swiss francs) which were to be applied to the Union's budget for technical cooperation and assistance.

## ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL

The Administrative Council approved the 1988 Union budget at a level of 106.086 million Swiss francs (approximately $75.776 million), representing a reduction of one percent from the 1987 budget. This negative budgetary change permitted a reduction of the U.S. contribution in Swiss francs for the second consecutive year. Although the dollar amount rose because of exchange rate fluctuations, the U.S. contribution in Swiss francs fell from 6.954 million (about $4.224 million) in 1987 to 6.894 million (about $5.286 million) in 1988. Corresponding savings were also realized by U.S. private sector members which collectively contributed about $1.5 million to the ITU.

The United States is one of six industrialized countries who are the major contributors to the ITU and are all assessed at the same level (6.5 percent). Savings in representation expenses, a smaller allocation for technical assistance and cooperation than in 1987, and a transfer from reserve funds enabled the

Union to contain its budget.

The issue of a financing plan to amortize an accumulated and increasing debt in administrative support costs for technical cooperation (described in *United States in the UN, 1986*, pages 238-39) remained unresolved. ITU's external auditor had noted in an earlier annual report that the 6.1 million Swiss franc deficit (about $2.440 million at the time) had to be addressed. The 41st Administrative Council (1986) approved an amortization plan which provided slightly over 4 million Swiss francs. A program for amortization of an additional 1.880 million Swiss francs, including an outlay from the 1988 regular budget, was approved by the 42nd (1987) Council.

However, because a shortfall in support costs for technical assistance and cooperation continued to accumulate, a deficit of approximately 5.85 million Swiss francs (about $4.180 million) was expected to remain at the end of 1988. The Secretariat said that continued and planned absorption of the shortfall within the regular budget would require either an increase in income, or a diminution of technical assistance services. The latter result was opposed by developing countries.

The Council asked that a further report on the shortfall in technical cooperation, and another partial amortization plan, be submitted to the 43rd Administrative Council in 1988. Subsequently, the 1989 Plenipotentiary Conference would need to reconsider both the appropriate level and financing structures of the ITU's technical assistance commitments so that adequate funding could be assured. It was expected that a determination of priority and resource levels for this activity would be a major focus of attention.

In other Council business, one potentially contentious issue concerning an Israeli request to participate in an African Regional Broadcasting Conference in 1989 was satisfactorily resolved by the Secretary General, following consultations with the United States and other delegations. A significant question centered on Israel's membership in the ITU's European region and the fact that the organization's regulatory practice does not usually include one state in two separate regions simultaneously. The Secretary General proposed that Israel and Tunisia, which had submitted a similar request, be permitted to attend the African conference as observers and to be party to any agreements arising from the conference. This solution was accepted by the plenary working group. The United States expressed appreciation for the Secretary General's efforts to avoid politicization of this issue and to resolve it on technical grounds.

Anthony Rutkowski, formerly with the U.S. Federal Communications Commission, assumed the post of Chief, Telecommunications Regulations and Relations Between Members Division, General Secretariat, in the fall of 1987.

# CENTER FOR TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVELOPMENT

The Center for Telecommunications Development, created by the Administrative Council of 1985 and established in 1986, became operational in 1987. Robert Baldwin (U.S.), formerly of A T & T, joined its staff as Chief of the Telecommunications Development Unit. The Center's purpose is to stimulate and accelerate the pace of development of telecommunications infrastructure and services in developing countries by providing advisory services at the pre-commercial, pre-investment stage of project development. In April, the Center's Advisory Board approved procedures for submission of requests for assistance, and criteria for equitable selection in accordance with defined priorities.

The Center sent out evaluation missions to 11 of the 37 countries which requested its services in 1987. Consultants were asked to assess needs, develop plans, and identify potential funding sources for recommended projects. As a result of these visits, projects were under preparation for nine countries: Burma, Cuba, Egypt, the Gambia, Mauritania, Nepal, Somalia, Tanzania, and Yemen Arab Republic.

The Center also held a regional seminar on Modern Planning Methods of Telecommunication Networks, in Montevideo, Uruguay in December. Participants from 17 countries in the Western hemisphere attended the seminar. Two U.S. companies volunteered experts to serve as instructors.

The Center's second Advisory Board was constituted in 1987. At the initiative of the Secretary General, Chairman of the Board Jean-Claude Delorme (Canada) was replaced by A.D. Ntagazwa of Tanzania. Paul Vishny, General Counsel to the U.S. Telecommunications Suppliers Association, served as the U.S. Representative on the Advisory Board. His deputy was Cecil Crump of A T & T.

Funding for the Center—in cash and in kind—is provided by voluntary donations from governments, institutions, and private industry. The Center estimated that it would need about 12 million Swiss francs annually to maintain its operations and programs. Since yearly donations had fallen below this figure, the Center formed a fund-raising working group and engaged a part-time consultant expert in this field. During 1987, 20 countries made direct contributions to the Center and others have pledged funds. Several U.S. telecommunications companies, including NYNEX and A T & T, contributed over $40,000 to the Center. Although the U.S. Government did not make a contribution in 1987, Congress approved funds allowing the United States to donate $200,000 to the Center in 1988.

U.S. policy toward the Center for Telecommunications Development is formulated by the *Ad Hoc* Group on Communications Development. The Group, composed of U.S. Government and private industry representatives, was chaired by Mr. Vishny.

## PLENIPOTENTIARY CONFERENCE PLANNING

The ITU planned to convene a Plenipotentiary Conference in mid-1989. In addition to the usual issues including budget planning and election of officers, the Plenipotentiary Conference was expected to adopt new basic instruments for the ITU.

The organization is unusual among international agencies in that it has no permanent constitution. Each Convention is in force only until the next Plenipotentiary Conference, normally held every 7th year. To avoid the time and expense of adopting a basic document at every such Conference, the Nairobi Conference (1982) established a Group of Experts charged with dividing the Nairobi Convention into two documents— a Constitution and a Convention—and with drafting amendment procedures. These documents were to be presented to the ITU Administrative Council and subsequently to the 1989 Plenipotentiary Conference.

The Group of Experts met first in January 1986 and held a second session in January 1987. The Group accomplished its first task of dividing the Nairobi Convention into two instruments and completed a draft Constitution. The United States was successful in having almost all of Article 15 (Finances of the Union) included in the Constitution. Voluntary selection of contribution levels, of major importance to the United States, was retained. However, the Group of Experts could not reach agreement on other critical issues, nor did it have time to prepare a draft Convention.

To advance work on the unresolved issues of amendment procedures, ratification and entry into force of the new instruments, as well as completion of a draft Convention, the Group of Experts established a drafting group. The drafting group, consisting of representatives from the Netherlands, Senegal, Japan, U.S.S.R., and the United States, under the chairmanship of Kotona Kis of Hungary, met in September. U.S. interests were served by the group's recommendations that a three-fourths majority be required for implementation of amendments to the Constitution and a two-thirds majority for the Convention. These recommendations were adopted by the Group of Experts, which will hold its 3rd and final session in January 1988.

## ITU TECHNICAL BODIES

### International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee (CCITT)

During 1987 the CCITT held numerous study group meetings in which U.S. industry and government representatives participated. The industrial and technical standards developed and promulgated by CCITT for international telecommunications are voluntarily accepted world-wide. At the end of the current 4-year plenary cycle, the CCITT will have produced about 10,000 pages of new telecommunications recommendations. The U.S. telecommunication industry participates actively in CCITT activities.

Issues within the CCITT included: consideration of tariff principles governing private leased lines, the use of personal computers in network operations, the Integrated Services Digital Network, and new technologies such as videotex, message handling, and international credit card recommendations.

Further progress was made on development of an international telecommunication credit card recommendation which would permit eventual issuance of a credit card usable worldwide. The CCITT's special study group on restructuring adopted most U.S. recommendations to reorganize its component committees on a more functional basis, thereby eliminating redundancies among the groups and reducing the required number of meetings. All of these issues will be reviewed at the CCITT's quadrennial Plenary Assembly scheduled for November 1988.

Representatives from government and industry participated in preparations for the 1988 World Administrative Telegraph and Telephone Conference (WATTC). Although the United States, supported by other governments, obtained ITU agreement to many draft regulations reflecting U.S. policy orientation, key objectives of liberalization in the provision of new telecommunication services and of reduced regulatory intervention by national administations were not fully realized. The United States remained concerned that the regulatory framework elaborated in the draft regulations exceeded the ITU's scope of authority as delimited in the existing Convention. The U.S. delegation to the December 1988 WATTC in Melbourne, Australia, will continue its efforts to amend these proposed regulations. The Conference is expected to adopt regulations affecting the use of many new services such as data transmission, computer networks, and image transmission.

### International Radio Consultative Committee (CCIR)

The CCIR carries out studies and develops international recommendations and specifications in the field of radiocommunications. Though nonbinding, the recommendations and specifications are generally observed by the telecommunications industry worldwide. Recognized private operating agencies, as well as other scientific and industrial entities of our private sector, participate in the activities of the CCIR and contribute to the cost of meetings. Participation in CCIR activities is carried out primarily through the U.S. National CCIR Organization, a long-standing federal advisory committee to the Department of State with over three hundred members drawn from the private sector and the federal government.

Representatives from eight specialized preparatory groups convened in Geneva in December as the Joint Interim Working Party to complete the CCIR's technical contributions to the 1988 World Administrative Radio Conference on Space Services (WARC-ORB 2). U.S. positions on such issues as use of the orbit-spectrum resource and flexible planning methods were integrated into the reports of the separate groups and subsequently reflected in the final document prepared by the JIWP. The results of the Space WARC were expected to have significant impact on the future development of satellite communications services.

### International Frequency Registration Board (IFRB)

The major function of the IFRB is to ensure the orderly recording of radio frequencies and satellite orbital positions which national administrations assign to their radio stations, including satellite systems. The Board also assists countries and administrative radio conferences in all matters related to radio spectrum management.

The IFRB was active in 1987 in dealing with the technical examination, coordination, and registration of frequency assignments. Progress also was made in the extended use of the ITU computer and implementation of the IFRB interim system. In the area of support to radio conferences, the Board was active in preparations for the Region 2 (Western Hemisphere) Expanded Band MF Broadcasting Conference (second session), scheduled for May 1988 in Rio de Janeiro, and in preparations for the 1988 Space WARC.

## Universal Postal Union (UPU)

### EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

The Executive Council of the Universal Postal Union met in Bern, Switzerland, from April 27 to May 15. The budget adopted for 1988 called for a total net expenditure of 22,497,420 Swiss francs, which was the same as the 1987 expenditure budget. Although new activities were funded in the 1988 budget, compensating savings produced a result of zero real (and zero nominal) growth. In terms of U.S. contributions, the 1988 U.S. assessment of 1,149,000 Swiss francs was the same as 1987, which represents approximately 5.11 percent of the total 1988 assessments .

The issue of greatest concern to the Council was the effort to develop a more rational terminal dues structure, the system by which member countries compensate each other for handling each other's mail. The Council also focused attention on the rapidly expanding international market in services for the movement of documents and goods. It noted the increase of competition in this market, and encouraged postal administrations to ensure that the quality of services was improved and costs controlled.

### CONSULTATIVE COUNCIL FOR POSTAL STUDIES (CCPS)

The United States is a member of the CCPS, a technical body which studies operational, economic, and technical cooperation problems of interest to member countries of the UPU. In 1987 the CCPS held a symposium focusing on improving quality and expanding membership of the international express mail service. There was also a colloquy with representatives of the media and publishing industry to discuss rates, quality of services, and introduction of new services. As a result of the colloquy, consideration was given to creating a Press-UPU Contact Committee.

## International Labor Organization (ILO)

The International Labor Organization's membership consists of government, worker, and employer delegations from 150 member countries. In 1987 the Governing Body of the ILO (28 member states and 14 each worker and employer delegations) met three times and the annual International Labor Conference was held in June in Geneva.

### THE GOVERNING BODY

#### Financial Problems

As the executive organ, the Governing Body deals with administrative and program issues. The most significant administrative issue in 1987 was the budget deficit stemming from a continuing fall in the value of assessed contributions, paid primarily in U.S. dollars, and from arrears in contributions by member states. Governing Body sessions in February-March and May grappled with the fall of the dollar from its revised budgeted exchange rate of 2.05 Swiss francs to the dollar to below 1.60. In May, the Governing Body authorized a supplementary credit to cover these exchange losses, to be financed by a withdrawal of up to $36 million from the Working Capital Fund. The U.S. delegation did not join the consensus on this measure. The Working Capital Fund was subsequently reduced to $12.1 million to finance a year-end 1987 cash deficit of $25 million.

The Governing Body continued its review of different financial mechanisms that could help the ILO to ameliorate the impact of rapid exchange rate movements in the 1988-89 biennium. Although the Secretariat had requested approval of the advance purchase of Swiss francs at a specified U.S. dollar price as a preferred mechanism to deal with this problem, the Governing Body deferred a decision on this approach until 1988 and after further study.

A second, equally serious, financial problem was the nonpayment or partial payment of assessed contributions. Seventy-four of the 140 members were behind in their payment of assessed contributions by year end 1987, accounting for a cumulative total of $36.7 million in arrears. A shortfall in U.S. appropriations made it impossible for the United States to pay in full its $31.6 million assessment. U.S. assessments totaled $63,285,000 for the 1986-87 biennium. At the end of 1987, the United States owed $23,562,822. Arrearages of other states were modest when compared to the ILO's $140 million annual budget.

### Budget Reform

The Governing Body adopted a key budget reform at its May 1987 session which the United States had sought to meet the requirements of U.S. law. The reform measure provided an additional consultative step in off-budget years to focus on a review of main program options and resource parameters with a view toward "reaching decisions thereon with the largest possible measure of consensus." The new mechanism linked the Medium-Term Plan (MTP) with biennial programs and budgets. It was designed to identify program priorities for 1990-1991 and subsequent periods within specific resource levels in real terms in the MTP. This was expected to permit members to provide additional guidance for elaboration of the program and budget proposals.

## ILO ANNUAL CONFERENCE

The 3-week ILO Annual Conference met in Geneva, June 3-23. Almost 1,800 government, worker, and employer delegates and advisors from 138 member countries of the ILO participated in the session. The Conference approved conclusions aimed at adoption of new international standards on employment policy and social security in 1988 and completed discussions toward a convention on safety and health in construction.

U.S. Secretary of Labor William E. Brock reiterated Director-General Blanchard's call for trade liberalization and increased investment to fight against unemployment, underemployment, and poverty. He emphasized that free trade policies stimulate economic growth, productivity, and employment. Secretary Brock also invited ILO and GATT attention to the "very real connection" between trade barriers and worker rights.

### 1988-1989 Budget

The Finance Committee called for reconsideration of the U.S. dollar/Swiss franc exchange rate of the budget, and forward purchase of Swiss francs by the June 1988 conference. It also noted that the Director-General was expected to propose 1988-1989 budget reductions of almost $7 million in February 1988 if the cash flow position of the ILO had improved sufficiently through payment of outstanding balances by major contributors.

The U.S. Delegate to the Conference, following earlier opposition to the budget proposal in the Finance Committee, supported the ILO's 1988-1989 budget of $324,860,000. The Conference vote on the 1988-1989 budget was 349 (U.S.) to 56, with 19 abstentions. Many delegates expressed appreciation for the change in the U.S. Government's position, which the U.S. delegate said was due to the Director General's pledge to continue to exert every effort to reduce further the 1988-89 budget level. For the first time in ILO history, the Soviet delegates registered a split vote. While the Soviet government delegates voted against the budget, their workers voted for it, and their employers abstained.

## Technical Agenda Items

The heart of the ILO's Annual Conference is its standard-setting activities, including the development of conventions, which, when ratified by governments, are legally binding. In recent years, many ILO members have advocated slowing the pace of developing new standards to allow governments time to act on those already on the books (the ILO has adopted 166 conventions since its creation in 1919).

**Employment Promotion and Social Security.** In adopting the wording of this agenda item, the Governing Body wished to place the problem of unemployment prevention and compensation in the wider framework of the relationship between social security and employment. The intention was to develop new standards and provide technical guidance attuned to the economic level and social priorities of developing countries. Based upon discussions, the Conference approved specific conclusions as a basis for adoption of a convention and recommendation in 1988.

**Safety and Health in Construction.** Recognizing that the construction industry has changed considerably since the relevant ILO instruments were adopted in 1937, the Governing Body included this item on the Conference agenda to consider revision of the Safety Provisions (Building) Convention (No. 62) and Recommendation (No. 53), and Cooperation in Accident Prevention (Building) Recommendation (No. 55). This first discussion, coupled with a questionnaire to governments, also anticipated the possibility of preparing a convention and recommendation for adoption in 1988.

**Technical Cooperation.** Given the substantial changes that had occurred since the last comprehensive review of this topic in 1977, the Conference reviewed the ILO's technical cooperation program. It adopted a resolution reaffirming the role of operational programs as a means of complementing and reinforcing the ILO's standard-setting work. The U.S. delegation believed that calls for increased coordination with UNDP resident representatives and integration of ILO activities in country planning were particularly positive outcomes of the Conference's review.

## Additional Resolutions

The Resolution Committee in 1987 was largely nonpoliticized and dealt with issues within the ILO's competence. The Committee adopted three resolutions: one on the International Year of Shelter for the Homeless, one celebrating the 40th Anniversary of the Adoption of the Freedom of Association Convention, and one on Measures Against Drugs and Alcohol Abuse in Working and Social Life. The U.S. Government representative offered an amendment to the first resolution that emphasized the role of the private sector. The United States was able to support all three resolutions in their final versions, and all three were adopted by consensus in both the

Committee and in plenary session.

A Soviet proposal to change the working rules of the Committee of Experts, which would have been opposed by the U.S. delegation, was placed in such a low priority that it did not come up for consideration. U.S. delegates felt that, if adopted, it would have undermined the objectivity and impartiality of the ILO's machinery for supervising the application of ILO standards of member states.

### Other Political Issues

The Apartheid Committee adopted detailed conclusions on June 15. The U.S. Government representative called for a vote, and voiced strong objections to the call for mandatory sanctions, stringent investment/disinvestment measures, and other actions considered outside the mandate of the ILO. The vote was 29 in favor, one opposed (U.S.), and one abstention (Belgium). In the plenary, the U.S. Government delegate called for a vote on adoption of the Committee report. The vote was 331 in favor, 8 against (U.S.), and 26 abstentions.

Before the vote, the U.S. Government Delegate emphasized that the United States is "committed to the destruction of the Apartheid system, but not to the destruction of the South African economy or the means of livelihood of the South African people." He noted that the United States had enacted the most comprehensive economic sanctions of any major Western industrial nation against South Africa, but continued to oppose the proposed mandatory sanctions.

The Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations adopted a comprehensive and balanced report. Poland participated in the Committee's discussion of its cases after a 4-year absence. Governments that had boycotted discussion of their labor rights cases in the past, including Romania and Nicaragua, also participated in 1987. The Iranian delegation walked out after a heated debate on employment discrimination in Iran, which the Committee listed under the heading "continued failure to implement."

### High-Level Meeting on Employment and Structural Adjustment

The June 1986 Labor Conference resolution on debt requested that a High-Level Meeting on Employment and Structural Adjustment be convened by the ILO. Following plans developed during the November 1986 Governing Body session, a Tripartite expert-level Preparatory Meeting was held in Geneva on April 27-29, 1987. Noting that the agenda of the high-level meeting had already been decided, the preparatory meeting recommended that discussions concentrate on the impact on employment, incomes and poverty of the recent and future world economy; effects on employment, incomes, and poverty of alternative policies and programs for more dynamic adjustment and growth; and the potential for joint action by international organizations, and in particular the role of the ILO, in promoting socially oriented patterns of dynamic adjustment and growth. The preparatory meeting also stressed that the discussions, conclusions, and possible proposals for action of the high-level meeting should be based upon the mandates of the ILO and of all international organizations concerned with social and economic matters.

The high-level meeting was convened in Geneva on November 23-25. Stressing the seriousness of the world economic situation, the "alarmingly high" number of unemployed and poor, and the "crushing problem of international indebtedness," the high-level meeting put forward proposals for policies and programs for more dynamic adjustment and growth in industrialized and developing countries and for action by international organizations. Discussions were nonconfrontational.

The U.S. Government had opposed both the preparatory and high-level meetings on the ground that the sensitive issues of structural adjustment, trade, and debt were regularly and more appropriately handled at the ministerial level by the World Bank, IMF, GATT, and other multilateral economic institutions. The United States, the Federal Republic of Germany, and the United Kingdom chose not to send official delegations.

### U.S. ACTION ON ILO CONVENTIONS

The U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee gave its approval in late 1987 to ratification of ILO Convention 144, concerning tripartite consultations on ILO matters, and Convention 147, concerning minimum standards on merchant ships.

This approval paved the way for full Senate action and final ratification. This action underscored official U.S. interest in the ILO in 1987, and marked the first U.S. ratification of an ILO convention in over 35 years.

## World Meteorological Organization (WMO)

The World Meteorological Organization (WMO) is a specialized agency of the United Nations responsible for promoting international cooperation in the collection, analysis and exchange of meteorological data, and in the application of meteorology to such areas as aviation, shipping, agriculture, and water resource management. Through its major programs, the WMO serves vital U.S. strategic and commercial interests, as well as a wide variety of human needs which depend upon accurate and timely exchange of meteorological information.

The WMO was established in March 1951, after the dissolution of the International Meteorological Organization (IMO). The IMO, which was founded in 1873 as a nongovernmental body, transferred its functions and responsibilities to the newly formed WMO which, as an intergovernmental organization, became a specialized agency of the UN. By the time of its second Congress session in 1955, the WMO had 83 members. In 1987 there were 160 members of the Organization, including 155 states and 5 territories.

## ORGANIZATION

The supreme body of the Organization is the WMO Congress, which consists of all members. It meets every 4 years to conduct a thorough review of WMO program activities, establish general policies and budgetary requirements for the next 4-year period, and conduct elections for officers of the Organization and members to the Executive Council. The Executive Council (EC) is a subsidiary body of the Congress, and meets at least once a year to supervise the implementation of the programs that the WMO Congress approves. The EC is composed of 36 directors of national meteorological or hydrometeorological services who serve on the Council in their personal capacity for a 4-year term.

## WMO CONGRESS

The 10th session of the WMO Congress convened May 4-29 in Geneva. It was followed immediately by the 39th session of the Executive Council. Among the most salient issues addressed by the Congress as part of its overall program review were the Organization's future involvement in the global climate change issue, a possible role for WMO in transmitting meteorological and other data pursuant to radiological emergencies, and the entire question of financial management and budgetary reform.

## MAJOR PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

### World Weather Watch

The World Weather Watch (WWW) is the basic program of the WMO, facilitating the collection, processing, and exchange of meteorological data among members. The 10th Congress reviewed the full range of WWW activities, and specific plans for the future work of its essential programs elements, including the Global Observing System (GOS), the Global Data-Processing System (GDPS), and the Global Telecommunication System (GTS). In response to a request by the WMO Congress, the EC established a working group to coordinate WMO activities relating to a nuclear or chemical accident involving hazardous materials with potential transboundary effects. The working group also served as the WMO focal point for consultations with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) regarding the use of the GTS in transmitting meteorological and radiological data in connection with the IAEA-sponsored Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident.

### World Climate Program

The objective of the World Climate Program (WCP) is to assist members in understanding climate processes in order to develop capabilities for monitoring and forecasting climate changes, and, where possible, mitigating their adverse effects. The Congress reviewed, in detail, the activities of the WCP and agreed to hold, in coordination with the UN Environment Program (UNEP) and the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU), a Second World Climate Conference in 1989/1990. Participants at this Conference will address a full range of climate issues, with particular emphasis upon the economic benefits of climate applications for developing states. In addition, the Congress adopted a U.S.-sponsored resolution endorsing an active WMO role in addressing the scientific aspects of global climate change, induced by the accumulation of pollutants (greenhouse gases) in the earth's atmosphere. As a followon to this resolution, the EC requested the Secretary General to establish, in coordination with UNEP, an *Ad Hoc* intergovernmental mechanism to carry out internationally-coordinated scientific assessments of the magnitude, timing, and potential impact of climate change.

### Hydrology and Water Resources Program

Many regions of the world face serious water problems, ranging from drought to major flood hazards, which have reinforced the need for efficient assessment, development, and management of water resources. In order to respond to this need, the Hydrology and Water Resources Program (HWRP) was established to ensure the assessment and forecasting of the quantity and quality of water resources. The HWRP aims to promote worldwide cooperation in the evaluation and development of water resources through the coordinated establishment of hydrological networks and services, including data collection and processing, hydrological forecastings and warnings, and the supply of meteorological and hydrological data for design purposes. In addition to approving HWRP activities for the next 4-year period, the 10th Congress changed the status of the Commission on Hydrology, thereby underscoring the increasing importance of hydrological and water resource activities to the social and economic development of many states.

### Research and Development

Under the WMO research and development program, the Organization seeks to promote better understanding of atmospheric processes. The Commission for Atmospheric Sciences (CAS) has the lead role within WMO for promoting and coordinating members' research efforts. The 10th Congress reaffirmed its basic priorities, including forecasting on all scales, tropical meteorology, environmental monitoring, cloud physics and weather modification, with special emphasis on the importance of applying research findings to the work of operational meteorological services.

### Technical Cooperation

WMO technical cooperation activities assist member states in the development and maintenance of national meteorological capabilities. The program is financed by the UN Development Program (UNDP), the WMO Voluntary Cooperation Program (VCP), trust funds, and the WMO regular budget. The principal source of funds for WMO technical cooperation activities is UNDP, which provides well over half of the total contributions. The large percentage of UNDP-funded projects, however, generated some financial difficulties for WMO in 1986 and 1987, since UNDP funding for administrative costs of project implementation have fallen short of WMO requirements due to exchange rate losses. The 10th Congress urged UNDP to review its policy regarding support costs for projects administered by WMO, in order to alleviate the problem of currency fluctuations.

## BUDGETARY AND FINANCIAL MATTERS

In response to U.S. leadership in behalf of budgetary reform throughout the UN system, the Executive Council (in 1986) recommended the establishment of a Financial Advisory Committee (FAC) to provide advice to the WMO Congress and the EC on all financial and budgetary questions. The proposal was adopted by the 10th Congress without vote, leading to the formation of a 15-member Committee, composed of the 8 largest donors (including the United States), the president of the WMO, and 6 regional representatives. In defining the functions of the FAC, the Congress stipulated that the Committee "shall follow the traditional procedures of such WMO bodies, seeking to formulate its proposals through consensus of views." The FAC met during the 10th Congress session to discuss its terms of reference and future work, and to provide recommendations to the Congress on a number of financial matters.

In accordance with general reform initiatives, the WMO Secretariat proposed a number of measures for easing the recent financial burden on the Organization generated by unpaid contributions and unfavorable exchange rates. Specifically, the Congress adopted a proposal to change the Organization's base currency unit from the U.S. dollar to Swiss franc. Since an estimated 88 percent of WMO expenditures is in Swiss francs, a change from a dollar-based budget is expected to provide a more predictable and steady level of program resources which will not be eroded by exchange rate losses. In addition, the Congress adopted a payment incentive scheme to discourage contribution of assessments late in the calendar year, took measures to define more precisely the nature of refundable cash surplus and approved a change from an annual to a biennial budget cycle within the 4-year financial period.

In recognition of the serious financial constraints facing the Organization, the WMO Congress approved a 4-year budget (1988-1991) ceiling which reflects a level of maximum expenditures slightly lower than zero real program growth over the preceding budget, with no increases in staff. The

Executive Council, meeting after conclusion of the 10th Congress, adopted a biennial program/budget within the framework of the 4-year budget ceiling. In order to offset, partially, anticipated exchange rate losses, the EC also approved a supplemental budget assessment of $5 million for 1987.

In implementing the 1987 WMO program/budget, the WMO Secretariat continued to experience serious cash-flow difficulties, particularly in the last quarter of the year, as a result of late or nonpayment of members' assessments for 1987. The WMO Secretary General continued to enforce a number of cost-cutting measures instituted in December 1986 to conserve limited resources. Despite these actions, the WMO exhausted its Working Capital Fund and was forced to resort to internal borrowing in October/November of 1987. Partial payment, in December, of the 1987 U.S. assessment to WMO ($2 million of a $5.7 million assessment) enabled the Organization to meet its end-of-year payroll.

## VOLUNTARY COOPERATION PROGRAM

The WMO established the Voluntary Cooperation Program (VCP) in 1967 at U.S. initiative. The VCP provides equipment and training to developing countries to permit them to participate in the WMO World Weather Watch and other programs. This global participation enables WMO members to gain access to a wide range of meteorological data. Without the VCP, many developing states would be unable to install costly weather monitoring equipment, so that valuable meteorological data (currently used by the United States to support civil aviation, shipping, the military, and storm detection/warning) would be unavailable. Members may make contributions to the VCP in cash payments to the Voluntary Cooperation Fund or as in-kind assistance in the form of equipment, expert services, and fellowships. In 1987 resources from the VCP fund were allocated by the Executive Council for spare parts, experts' travel, fellowships and several high priority programs. Total VCP in-kind contributions, which represent roughly 95 percent of the overall VCP, recorded donations from members in response to specific requests from developing countries totaled approximately $6.2 million in 1987. The United States pledged $2 million to the VCP in 1987, of which approximately $1.9 million is being provided as in-kind assistance to developing states.

## ELECTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS

Secretary General G.O.P. Obasi was unanimously reelected to a second 4-year term by the WMO Congress. In addition, Congress elected Mr. Zou Jingmeng (China) as President of the WMO, and Dr. John Zillman (Australia), Comm. Salvador Alaimo (Argentina), and Dr. John Houghton (UK) as Vice-Presidents of the Organization. Other representatives (including the Director of the U.S. National Weather Service, Dr. Richard Hallgren) were elected to serve on the 36-member Executive Council for 4-year terms.

## International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)

Since the beginning of the nuclear era, those involved with nuclear energy have recognized that some of the nuclear materials and technology used in peaceful nuclear development programs could be diverted and adapted for use in the production of nuclear explosives. It was also widely recognized that the further spread of nuclear explosives would pose a serious threat to the peace and security of all states. Consequently, members of the international community came to realize that if the many peaceful benefits of nuclear energy were to be made widely available, some mechanism was essential to provide credible assurance that nuclear material and technology in peaceful nuclear programs continued to be used exclusively for peaceful purposes.

Prompted by this realization, the United States led the effort to establish the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in 1957. The Statute of the IAEA clearly reflects the dual role the IAEA must play in the international nuclear community, and specifies that the IAEA should seek to "accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health, and prosperity throughout the world. . ." and ensure "so far as it is able, that assistance provided by it or at its request or under its supervision or control is not used in such a way as to further any military purpose."

Thus, the IAEA is called on to promote the safe and peaceful uses of nuclear energy and to deter the misuse of nuclear material for nonpeaceful purposes. To assist in the development of nuclear energy, the IAEA provides technical cooperation to many of its developing member states. The IAEA performs its deterrent role through the application of international safeguards.

The safeguards system is a unique system of international verification of national commitments undertaken at the request of member states. On-site inspections by the IAEA include audits of facility records, independent measurements to verify facility records and national reports, and use of instrumental surveillance and seals. The system is not designed to control or regulate national nuclear programs. Rather, its purpose is to deter through threat of timely detection, the diversion of significant quantities of nuclear material from peaceful to nonpeaceful purposes.

Safeguards and technical cooperation represent the primary activities of the IAEA. However, the IAEA also maintains a program of active support to its members in a number of areas, including nuclear safety, transport of nuclear material, and nuclear waste management.

The day-to-day implementation of IAEA programs is conducted by the IAEA Secretariat, headed by Director General Hans Blix (Sweden), and located in Vienna. Policy review and guidance is provided, *inter alia*, by the 35-member Board of Governors which generally meets in February and June, and in September in conjunction with the annual meeting of the IAEA General Conference. The General Conference is open to participation by all of the 113 members of the IAEA, and serves as a forum for discussion of a range of issues among members.

The IAEA has long been regarded as one of the most effective and well-managed international technical organizations. The outstanding quality of the organization's work and its ability to respond quickly and effectively to members' needs has been demonstrated repeatedly, most recently in response to the April 1986 Chernobyl nuclear accident and the September 1987 nuclear radition source accident in Goiania, Brazil.

## BOARD OF GOVERNORS

The February 1987 meeting of the IAEA Board of Governors provided an opportunity for the Board to review and evaluate the volume of nuclear safety-related work undertaken by the Secretariat in response to the Chernobyl nuclear reactor accident in the Soviet Union. Considerable attention focused on additional measures which might be taken to strengthen further the international nuclear safety regime. These included, *inter alia*, increased sharing of safety-related information, and possible means to expand bilateral and multilateral cooperation in emergency assistance and evaluation of information pursuant to an accident.

In addition to a focus on nuclear safety, IAEA Director General Blix drew the attention of the Board to the importance of prompt payment of members' assessed contributions. In light of an increasing tendency for some members to make partial or late assessed payments, the Director General underscored that the Agency could face a serious cash-flow problem by the end of 1987.

In a long and difficult session in June, the Board interrupted its substantive consideration of an annual detailed report on safeguards implementation at the insistence of a few Board members, to consider a formal recommendation to suspend South Africa from the rights and privileges of membership in IAEA. After considerable and sometimes heated debate, the Board decided, by a vote of 22 to 12 (U.S.) with 1 abstention, to recommend to the 1987 IAEA General Conference the suspension of South Africa. The United States strongly opposed this action by the Board, citing, *inter alia*, that suspension would violate the longstanding and important principle of universality of membership in IAEA, and be legally inconsistent with the Agency's Statute.

Continuing its February discussion on nuclear safety, the Board commended the Agency's Report describing IAEA's nuclear safety activities in 1986. Many Board members, including the United States, praised the expanded use of Operational Safety Review Teams (OSARTS) to review safety practices at individual nuclear facilities and to make recommendations regarding possible improvements in these practices. Similarly, many Board members underscored the importance of the Agency's Incident Reporting System (IRS) as a means to evaluate problems in nuclear safety and help to prevent future problems.

Culminating months of detailed discussion, the Board agreed to recommend to the General Conference adoption of the proposed IAEA Budget for 1988. This budget, like those since 1984, provides for zero real growth for all IAEA programs, except for a very modest increase of 0.6 percent in nuclear safety. As he had at the February meeting, Director General Blix again cited the difficulties the Agency anticipated at the end of 1987 if IAEA members did not make prompt payment of their assessments for 1987 (under Agency regulations, these payments are due in January each year).

Concern regarding the Agency's cash-flow difficulties escalated at the September meetings of the Board. While the Board devoted considerable attention to the causes and consequences of the cash-flow problem, no viable means to mitigate this problem were identified by the time of the Board's sessions either prior to or immediately following the end of the 1987 General Conference. In response to an anticipated deficit of several million dollars by November, Director General Blix announced a number of austerity measures, including a freeze on IAEA recruitment, postponement of all but essential staff travel, and suspension of equipment purchases. In recognition of the need to respond to the pending cash flow crisis, the Board agreed in general to an increase in the Agency's working capital fund. However the Board was not able to agree on a new ceiling for the working capital fund or on a means whereby increased contributions would be made to the fund.

In addition to its discussion of the Agency's cash-flow situation, the Board reviewed again several nuclear safety issues. At its session immediately preceding the General Conference, the Board finalized a report on a number of nuclear safety issues for the General Conference.

## 1987 GENERAL CONFERENCE

The 1987 General Conference marked the 30th anniversary of the IAEA. Secretary of Energy John Herrington, head of the U.S. Delegation to the General Conference, joined with other IAEA members in noting IAEA's many accomplishments over the past 30 years. Secretary Herrington delivered a congratulatory message from President Reagan which underscored that

> Over the past three decades, the IAEA has served as a model of effective international cooperation, fostering peace and prosperity worldwide. Through its safeguards activities, the Agency has been an invaluable part of efforts to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons, and has worked with competence and success to promote the peaceful uses of the atom through its technical cooperation, nuclear safety, and research activities...The IAEA has been and remains an organization of singular importance to the United States, and one within the broader UN system which has demonstrated exceptional commitment to the purposes and principles for which it was established thirty years ago.

In his address to the General Conference, IAEA Director General Blix provided a comprehensive overview of the Agency's activities, including nuclear safety, support for nuclear programs in developing countries with emphasis on nonpower applications, safeguards, nuclear waste disposal, and the need for continued effective international cooperation in the nuclear area. Blix also repeated his concern regarding the Agency's difficult financial circumstances, noting that at the end of August 1987, 52 percent of the Agency's budget for 1987 (or $69.1 million) remained unpaid, and $10.6 million was outstanding from the 1986 budget. In conclusion, Blix reflected on the important role of the IAEA in the international area, stating,

> The framers of the IAEA's Statute gave us an effective and viable framework. Over 30 years an institution has been built up that serves its members with competence and efficiency. The messages received on the Agency's anniversary are testimony of the value attributed to the Agency by members and most gratifying at a time when international organizations have been the subject of such criticism. We should preserve the Agency's reputation as a technical, practical and responsible institution, we should exercise patience and prudence as we address difficult issues, and we should concentrate on those areas where we can make real contributions to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. If we succeed in this we could be proud to have achieved something useful and to have created a hope that common interests can be defined and competently dealt with in the midst of surrounding controversy and contradiction.

Secretary Herrington's opening address to the General Conference plenary was followed by statements by approximately 80 of the Agency's other members, many of whom stressed the important role of the IAEA in facilitating international cooperation in the nuclear field, and highlighted the Agency's accomplishments over 30 years. The Conference then dealt with a number of substantive issues, including adoption of the Agency's 1988 budget, election of 11 new members (for 2-year terms) to the 35-member Board of Governors, and adoption of an agreed target figure for funding the Agency's Technical Cooperation Program in 1988. Lackluster debate regarding an agenda item entitled "Israeli Nuclear Capabilities and Threat" ended with adoption of a resolution (48 to 29 (U.S.) with 12 abstentions) calling on Israel to adopt safeguards on all its nuclear facilities. In a strong statement against the resolution, U.S. Representative Ambassador Kennedy emphasized that much of the language in the resolution was discriminatory and singled out Israel for failing to accept a condition which other IAEA members themselves were not willing to accept.

In response to the recommendation by the Board of Governors to suspend South Africa from its rights and privileges of membership in IAEA, the General Conference decided by a vote of 60 to 28 (U.S.) with 4 abstentions to defer action on suspension until the 1988 General Conference. This action was taken, in part, in response to a South African statement on September 21 that "the Republic of South Africa is prepared to commence negotiations with each of the nuclear-weapons states on the possibility of signing the Nonproliferation Treaty." Many IAEA members regarded this statement as potentially significant and opted to provide South Africa with time to pursue it prior to taking action regarding South African suspension from IAEA.

## IAEA PROGRAMS

### Safeguards

During 1987 the Agency continued to dedicate a major effort to effective implementation of international safeguards. The IAEA safeguards system serves vital national security and non-proliferation interests for all nations. Consequently, efforts to improve and strengthen safeguards remain a continuing priority. The Agency seeks to meet its ever-increasing safeguards responsibilities by the effective use of sophisticated technology and well-trained staff. In 1987 the United States continued to play a major role in efforts to strengthen safeguards, improving both the effectiveness and efficiency of the system. The U.S. Program of Technical Assistance to Safeguards provided over $6 million in voluntary contributions towards this effort.

In 1987 the IAEA conducted 2135 safeguards inspections representing 9556 man-days of inspection. This is compared to 2054 inspections involving 8292 inspector man-days in 1986. This 15 percent increase in inspection effort was achieved with a 5 percent increase in available (trained and designated) inspectors. Continued progress in the implementation of advanced techniques is reflected by the 26 percent increase in the use of nondestructive assay equipment during inspections (on top of an 18 percent increase in 1986). This technique permits prompt verification of nuclear materials without the need for shipment and laboratory analysis of samples.

High priority was also given in 1987 to promoting more effective management, maintenance, and procurement of safeguards equipment. This emphasis is designed in part to assist the IAEA in incorporating and utilizing new and advanced safeguards equipment as it becomes available, thus encouraging continual updating and the application of the most effective safeguards techniques possible. The IAEA is now developing or deploying the second or third generation safeguards technology to meet the challenges of an increasingly complex nuclear industry and zero-real growth in budgets.

The IAEA also continued negotiation of a safeguards agreement with the Peoples' Republic of China, in response to the 1985 Chinese voluntary offer to accept IAEA safeguards on certain of their nuclear installations, and North Korea, following that country's adherence to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in 1986. In addition, Spain ratified the NPT in November 1987 and will now be part of the European Community's NPT safeguards agreement with the IAEA.

### Technical Cooperation

The IAEA's Program of Technical Assistance and Cooperation is a significant part of the Agency's total operation. In 1987 the IAEA provided technical cooperation to approximately 70 of its 113 members. This assistance takes a variety of forms. A considerable portion of the technical assistance and cooperation program involves assistance in applications of radioisotopes and radiation in agriculture, medicine, biology, hydrology, and industry. Emphasis is also placed on cooperation in nuclear power and nuclear safety, with the remainder of the program devoted to other nuclear-energy activities, including nuclear physics and chemistry, prospecting, mining and processing of uranium and thorium ores, and general nuclear-energy development. Equipment, training and fellowships, and the services of experts in the nuclear field are also provided.

While the IAEA's safeguards program as well as IAEA laboratories and other programs are funded from the assessed budget of the Agency, the technical cooperation program is funded from voluntary contributions. In 1987 the United States pledged approximately $8.2 million of the target figure of $34 million sought for contributions to the 1987 Technical Assistance and Cooperation Fund. In addition, the United States provided over $4 million in support of training courses, expert services, fellowships and technical cooperation projects in IAEA member states party to either the NPT or the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

**Nuclear Safety**

In conjunction with its work in nuclear safety, the IAEA provides Operational Safety Review Teams (OSART) to IAEA members requesting them to help review safety measures at specific nuclear facilities. During 1987 the IAEA conducted 10 OSART missions at nuclear power plants operating or under construction in 7 countries, including Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Mexico, the Netherlands, Spain, and the United States. According to the IAEA's Annual Report for 1987, "experts from 29 member states (with 19 observers from 11 developing countries) carried out in-depth review of operation organization management programs, plant operation, maintenance, personnel, training, technical support, chemistry, operating experience feedback, radiological protection, and emergency preparedness. Preparatory work was done for 1988 missions to Italy; Hungary, and Sweden. OSART guidelines were published, and a first report on generic OSART findings, based on the results of missions through May 1987, was prepared for publication."

The year 1987 also witnessed expanded use of IAEA's Incident Reporting System, with reviews of 421 incidents, up from the previous 266. Nuclear safety experts met in a variety of fora to exchange information and update, as necessary, international guidelines and codes of practice in nuclear safety. IAEA was also involved in work regarding handling of severe nuclear accidents, and providing assistance on the selection of safe sites for nuclear facilities.

## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

On October 19 Director General Blix presented the IAEA's annual report to the UN General Assembly. Much of Blix's statement regarding IAEA's work in 1986 dealt with the Chernobyl accident and IAEA's comprehensive response to it. Blix noted that while the Chernobyl accident had undermined public confidence in nuclear power, it prompted significant action to prevent or mitigate the effects of future accidents. Blix emphasized the spirit of cooperation and productivity which contributed to the successful drafting and signing of two new international conventions regarding nuclear accidents, both concluded under IAEA auspices. He also highlighted on-going work to update nuclear safety codes of practice and enhance international cooperation in nuclear safety.

After summarizing IAEA's work in nuclear safeguards and technical cooperation in 1986, Blix struck a cautionary note regarding the Agency's budget. Blix underscored that although the role of the IAEA had expanded, its budget had not increased. Hence, the Agency would soon reach the point at which IAEA members would have to accept a reduction of activities or provide additional funding. Partial and/or late payments by members only exacerbated the Agency's cash-flow difficulties.

Following the statement by the Director General, representatives of 19 countries, including the United States, commended the report. Many noted, in particular, IAEA's effective and prompt response to the Chernobyl accident. In delivering the U.S. statement, Ambassador Okun praised IAEA's ability to deal with its budgetary constraints and maintain program effectiveness. Ambassador Okun stressed that this ability was especially evident in the Agency's implementation of safeguards, where demands for increased application of safeguards continue to increase, notwithstanding growing budgetary stringencies. At the end of its discussion of the Director General's report, the General Assembly adopted by consensus draft resolution A/42/L.6 which expresses approval of the IAEA report. (Resolution 42/6.)

## Part 3

# Trusteeship and Dependent Areas

## INTRODUCTION

UN concern for decolonization stems from the principles of equality and self-determination espoused in the UN Charter. Chapter XI of the Charter sets forth the responsibilities of states for "the administration of territories whose people have not yet attained a full measure of self-government." These "non-self-governing territories" are considered annually by the Special Committee on the Situation With Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (Committee of 24)* and by the General Assembly's Fourth Committee. The C-24 makes suggestions and recommendations to the Fourth Committee regarding (1) implementation of UN General Assembly resolution 1514 of 1960, the "Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples"; (2) specific issues affecting the decolonization process, such as the activities of foreign economic and military interests in non-self-governing territories; and (3) the activities of specialized agencies and other UN bodies in those territories.

The United States is firmly committed to self-determination for all peoples. However, it does not agree with the view of the C-24 that equates self-determination only with independence. The United States views independence as only one possible outcome of self-determination, and the status of a territory must reflect the freely expressed wishes of its people. General Assembly resolution 1514 of 1960 explicitly recognizes the following as legitimate outcomes of the act of self-determination for a non-self-governing territory: (1) independence, (2) free association with an independent state, or (3) integration with an independent state. Thus, the outcome of the act of self-determination should be determined by the freely expressed wishes of the people of the territory.

---

* Members of the C-24 in 1987 were: Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Mali, Sierra Leone, Sweden, Syria, Tanzania, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, U.S.S.R., Venezuela, and Yugoslavia.

It is also the position of the United States that whether or not military bases interfere with the right of self-determination can only be decided on a case-by-case basis, after careful examination of the special circumstances of the territory in question. The United States has consistently opposed General Assembly resolutions calling for specialized agency cooperation with, and assistance to, "national liberation movements."

## SPECIAL COMMITTEE (COMMITTEE OF 24)

Although the number of non-self-governing nations has declined over the years, the United Nations still has great interest in areas it considers "colonial." During 1987 the Committee of 24 considered the situation in Namibia, Western Sahara, Gibraltar, Tokelau, Pitcairn Island, St. Helena, American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (TTPI), Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Montserrat, Turks and Caicos Islands, Anguilla, U.S. Virgin Islands, and the Falkland Islands (Malvinas).

The United States annually presents information on the political, economic and social status of American Samoa, Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. The United States does not recognize C-24 jurisdiction over Puerto Rico and TTPI. The General Asembly removed Puerto Rico from its list of non-self-governing territories in 1953, and the Charter assigns responsibility for TTPI solely to the Security Council and through it to the Trusteeship Council. The United States does not participate in C-24 discussions on either of these issues.

The C-24 held 17 meetings at 2 sessions in 1987. The first session took place between February 24 and March 17 and the second session between August 3 and August 14. In a statement at the opening of the first session, the UN Secretary General emphasized the UN's commitment to Namibian independence and deplored the impasse caused by South Africa's linkage of "extraneous issues" to the UN's plan for granting independence. He refrained from making specific comments on other decolonization issues. At the same meeting, the C-24 elected a new Chairman, Ethiopian Permanent Representative Tadesse. In his acceptance speech, Tadesse referred only generally to the issues before the committee. He expressed regret that certain Western members of the Security Council had blocked efforts to impose mandatory sanctions on South Africa but did not mention any member state by name. The C-24 then adopted the Chairman's suggestions relating to the work of the organization.

Sweden, speaking at the opening of the first session as the only Western member of the C-24, emphasized Nordic support for its work, called on it to operate by consensus, and cautioned against sweeping rhetoric as well as taking sides on East-West issues with strategic implications. Czechoslavakia called for greater coordination between the C-24, the Council for Namibia, and the Committee Against Apartheid. Indonesia again indicated its opposition to the inclusion of the question of East Timor on the C-24's agenda. The Fijian Permanent Representative, citing the resolution adopted at the 41st General Assembly, requested that the C-24 again take up the question of New Caledonia. The C-24 agreed to do so.

## TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS (TTPI)

Since 1947 the United States has administered, by trusteeship agreement with the Security Council, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Article 83 of the UN Charter assigned responsibility for strategic trusts to the Security Council, which in turn delegated the routine oversight task to the Trusteeship Council. The United States cooperates fully with and reports annually to the Trusteeship Council.

TTPI originally consisted of more than 2,100 small islands known collectively as Micronesia, with a total land area of about 700 square miles in an area of the Pacific equivalent in size to the continental United States. About 100 of the islands are inhabited, with a total estimated population of about 140,000. Three distinct islands groups constituted the Trust Territory: the Marianas (excluding Guam), the Carolines, and the Marshalls.

Formerly administered by Japan under a League of Nations mandate, the islands came under U.S. control in World War II. After the founding of the United Nations and its Trusteeship system, the United States and the UN Security Council concluded an agreement on July 18, 1947, creating the TTPI as a strategic trust territory under U.S. administration. From 1951, the U.S. Department of the Interior administered TTPI.

On their own initiative, the peoples of TTPI divided politically into four separate territories. In 1975 the people of the Northern Mariana Islands (NMI) chose to join the United States as a commonwealth and began to function in 1976 as a separate administrative unit with a popularly elected governor and legislature, pending termination of the Trusteeship Agreement. After termination, commonwealth status would give domiciliary inhabitants of the NMI full U.S. citizenship and self-government in accordance with the NMI constitution and as defined in the covenant adopted by the peoples of the islands. In 1978 peoples in the Caroline Islands of Kosrae, Ponape, Truk, and Yap voted in a constitutional referendum to establish the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM). They formed federal and state governments in 1979. That year, the Marshall Islands also voted to form a constitutional government, the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI). The people of Palau in the Carolines formed the Republic of Palau in 1981.

Since 1960 representatives of the islands negotiated with the United States to determine their political status upon termination of the Trusteeship. In contrast to the Northern Mariana islanders, the peoples of the FSM, RMI, and Palau chose free association, a relationship defined in a Compact of Free Association. The relationship is terminable by either or both parties, provides for self-government in domestic and foreign affairs, and recognizes the Freely Associated States as sovereign. The United States must provide economic assistance for the life of the compacts with the island states and is responsible for their defense and security.

The governments of the FSM and RMI approved the compact in accordance with their constitutional processes and in UN-observed plebiscites. The U.S. Congress passed the Compact legislation in December 1985, and the President signed it in January 1986.

On May 28, 1986, in resolution 2183 (LIII), the Trusteeship Council determined that the United States had fulfilled its obligations as trustee and asked it to implement expeditiously the new status arrangements negotiated with TTPI governments and ratified by their peoples in UN-observed acts of self-determination.

In October and November 1986, after the United States had notified the UN Secretary General on October 23 of our intentions, the new status arrangements for the RMI, FSM, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands were brought into force. President Reagan issued a Presidential Proclamation on November 3 noting that the United States had fulfilled its obligations under the Trusteeship Agreement with respect to these island groups and that they were now self-governing and no longer subject to the Trusteeship, in accordance with the wishes of the peoples concerned.

In Palau the February 1983 plebiscite on the compact was accompanied by a referendum question to reconcile provisions of a section of the Palauan constitution with certain defense and security provisions of the Compact. Terms of the constitution required that 75 percent of those voting approve the question. The United States and Palau renegotiated the language of the Compact after the 62 percent majority in the plebiscite fell short. An internal referendum in 1984 also failed to obtain the necessary 75 percent. The Compact was revised again and signed on January 10, 1986. A UN-observed plebiscite approved that Compact on February 21, 1986, with a 72 percent affirmative vote. Palauan constitutional processes ratified the results, and the U.S. Congress approved the Compact on October 16. On November 14, the U.S. President signed it into law.

A successful legal challenge prompted the Palauan Supreme Court to rule that a section of the Compact was sufficiently important that the entire Compact would require 75 percent approval. On December 2, 1986, the Compact received 64 percent, still short of the percentage required. In 1987 Palau held two further votes on the Compact. The UN-observed plebiscite of June 30 again resulted in a majority in favor of the Compact, still insufficient for passage. The legislature of Palau then voted to submit to Palauan voters a constitutional amendment that would alter the compact approval requirement from a 75 percent vote in favor to a simple majority. On August 4, th Palauans amended their constitution by a majority of the vote in thre quarters of the states. The popular vote in favor was 73 percent. On Augu 21, 73 percent of Palauan voters voted to approve the Compact in a plebisci observed by a Trusteeship Council mission, and the President of Pala certified the results. The U.S. President, in transmitting to Congress th proposed joint resolution for Compact implementation on November 3 certified that Palau had completed its internal process to approve th Compact. Palau remains under the trusteeship, pending completion by th United States of the legislative process necessary to bring the Compact of Fr Association into force.

## Trusteeship Council Consideration

The Trusteeship Council was set up to oversee the 11 UN Trusteeshi under the international trusteeship system established in Chapter XII of th Charter. TTPI is the sole territory remaining under the system. Th Trusteeship Council consists of the five permanent members of the Securi Council: China, France, Soviet Union, United Kingdom, and the United State which is the administering authority. China has chosen not to participate the Council's work.

The Trusteeship Council met several times in 1987. At the 54th session the Trusteeship Council from May 11-28, the United States presented its annu report for the year ending September 30, 1986. The report was extended f the NMI, RMI, and FSM to include the implementation of new stat agreements in October and November 1986. In 15 meetings, the Council hea statements by representatives of the United States as administering authori including its special representatives and advisers, and by other coun members. In her opening statement, Ambassador Patricia M. Byrne recall that the Council had responded to the requests by Micronesian governmen for termination of the Trusteeship Agreement when it adopted resolution 218 She noted that the United States had respected fully the wishes of the peop of the Territory and had duly reported all measures taken to comply wi resolution 2183. President Lazarus Salii of Palau, special representative of t administering authority, explained Palau's repeated votes on the Compact Free Association and asked the Council to witness a fifth plebiscite on Palau political future in June 1987. He observed that in previous plebiscites the vo favoring the Compact had ranged between 62 and 72 percent. The need f the United States to carry out its responsibility to defend Palau, howev conflicted with non-nuclear provisions of the Palauan constitution, th requiring a favorable vote of 75 percent or amendment of the constitution. I urged all parties to respect Palau's right to resolve its future witho interference.

The Council received written and oral petitions and communications a questioned American and Micronesian representatives. On May 28 t

Council, by a 3 to1 vote, adopted the report of its drafting committee which recalled resolution 2183 (LIII) and recommended that the process of approval of the Compact of Free Association for Palau be completed at the earliest possible date. The Council noted that the people of the Trust Territory have "elected to assume full reponsibility for administration in the economic, social, and educational fields," and "noted with satisfaction" the assurances given by the United States that it would continue to fulfill its responsibilities under the Charter and under the Trusteeship Agreement.

At the 18th special session held on August 13, the Council acceded to the request of Palau to send a visiting mission to observe the plebiscite of August 21. U.S. representative Robert Rosenstock endorsed the request, noting that in the June 30 plebiscite "67.6 percent—some two thirds—of the voters of Palauan voted to accept the Compact." He observed that the both houses of Palau's national legislature had adopted the legislation for the August 4 constitutional referendum and the August 21 plebiscite unanimously. In the August 4 referendum, "a majority of the people of Palau again made clear their wish to enter into a new relationship with the United States, a relationship based on the Compact of Free Association." He stated that recent events showed clearly that "Palauan democracy was vibrant and deeply rooted." The Council adopted the draft resolution to send a mission to Palau. At a second meeting on August 13, the Council considered and took decisions on 41 written petitions and 4 written communications.

## U.S. TERRITORIES

### Special Committee Consideration

The Committee of 24 considered American Samoa, Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands on August 5. As the administrative authority concerned, the United States presents statements to the C-24 on the U.S. small territories and provides information on these territories to the UN Secretariat, in accordance with Article 73(e) of the UN Charter.

### American Samoa

American Samoa is an unincorporated and unorganized U.S. territory located 2,300 miles southwest of Hawaii. It comprises seven islands in the South Pacific, and has a total area of 76 square miles and a population of about 35,000. The territory of American Samoa has been voluntarily associated with the United States since 1899. The United States acquired six of the islands through agreements with indigenous leaders during the early 1900's and the seventh in 1925.

The C-24 adopted the conclusions and recommendations of its Subcommittee on the Small Territories concerning American Samoa, and decided to submit a draft resolution to the General Assembly. Among other things, the draft reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of Americar Samoa to self-determination and independence, and called on the Unitec States to take all necessary steps to expedite the process of decolonization ir accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and the Declaration The resolution took note of the continuing process of constitutional reviews through popular consultations and through the work of the constitutiona review committee. The resolution also noted the importance of fostering ar awareness among the people of American Samoa of the possibilities open tc them in exercising their right to self-determination and independence, anc called on the United States to strengthen and diversify the economy of th Territory.

## Guam

Guam is an organized, unincorporated U.S. territory. It was ceded to th United States by Spain in 1898 at the conclusion of the Spanish-American Wai About 30 miles long and 4-8 miles wide, Guam is the southernmost island ir the volcanic Mariana Islands chain in the western Pacific, about 6,000 mile west of San Francisco, and has a population of approximately 115,000.

The C-24's recommendations were submitted to the General Assembly ir the form of a draft resolution. The resolution *inter alia* reaffirmed th inalienable right of the people of Guam to self-determination an independence and noted the C-24's strong conviction that military bases an installations in Guam could constitute an obstacle to the implementation of th Declaration. It urged the United States to continue to take all necessar measures not to involve the territory in offensive acts; to comply fully with th purposes and principles of the Charter, the Declaration, and the resolution and decisions of the General Assembly relating to military activities. It als urged the United States to strengthen and diversify Guam's economy especially in the areas of commercial fishing and agriculture and to safeguar the right of the Guamanians to the natural resources of the territory, includin its territorial waters. The resolution took note of the statement by th representative of the administering power that the Guam Commission on self determination had completed its work on the draft text of a Commonwealt Act, and that voters would be required, in a referendum, to pronounc themselves on the draft text. The most important political development of th year was the referendum on the draft Commonwealth Act. On August 8, 198 voters approved 10 of 12 sections of the Act. The two sections which were nc approved, dealing with indigenous rights and immigration, were redrafte and approved by voters in a referendum on November 7.

## U.S. Virgin Islands

The U.S. Virgin Islands, also an organized and unincorporated U.S territory, were purchased from Denmark in 1917. The most prominent of thes islands located 1,000 miles southeast of Miami are St. Thomas, St. Croix, an

St. John. The population of the territory is about 110,000, and total land area is approximately 130 square miles.

The C-24's recommendations were submitted to the General Assembly in the form of a draft resolution. The draft resolution reaffirmed the inalienable right of the people of the U.S. Virgin Islands to self-determination and independence, took note of the general elections held in the territory on November 4, 1986, reiterated the responsibility of the United States to create conditions that aid the people of the islands in exercising these rights, and urged the United States to take measures to diversify and expand the territory's infrastructure, and promote economic and social development. The draft also urged the United States to continue to take all necessary measures to comply with the purposes and principles of the Charter, the Declaration, and General Assembly resolutions that relate to the military activities of administrating powers and their territories.

## General Assembly Action

American Samoa, Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands were considered, along with a number of other small territories, during the annual session of the Fourth Committee held during the month of October under the agenda item "Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples."

On October 23 Ambassador Byrne addressed the Committee, pointing out that the people of American Samoa, Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands have affirmed and reaffirmed in election after election their strong desire to exercise self-determination, while maintaining a close relationship with the United States. She called special attention to general elections held in American Samoa and the U.S. Virgin Islands in November 1986, as well as the referendum on the draft Commonwealth Act held in Guam in August 1987. She noted the United States has no military bases or troops stationed in American Samoa or the U.S. Virgin Islands and stressed the untruthfulness of allegations that the presence of military facilities and personnel in Guam was a major impediment to Guam's self-determination.

On October 28 the Fourth Committee adopted the resolutions on American Samoa, Guam and the Virgin Islands without vote. This followed a successful move by the U.S. delegation to remove references to UN General Assembly resolution 41/41 B in the Guam and U.S. Virgin Islands draft resolutions. Resolution 41/41B "calls upon the colonial powers to withdraw immediately and unconditionally from their military bases and installations from colonial territories, to refrain from establishing new ones and not to involve those territories in offensive acts or interference against other states." The final resolutions on both Guam and U.S. Virgin Islands restored the consensus language of 1986. The plenary adopted these three resolutions without vote on December 4. (Resolutions 42/87, 42/88, and 42/89.)

The Fourth Committee decided in October not to include the resolution on Puerto Rico on its agenda. However, it was mentioned in the C-24 repor adopted in the Committee and subsequently in plenary. (Resolution 42/73.)

## NAMIBIA

### Security Council Consideration

During 1987 the United States continued its intensive efforts to bring independence to Namibia based on UN Security Council resolution 435 (1978) The Security Council met 13 times on the question during the year. It adopted one resolution on the subject. This was sponsored by the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) members of the Council: Argentina, Congo, Ghana, the United Arab Emirates, and Zambia. On Namibia Day, August 26, the President of the Security Council issued a statement that reiterated the call for Namibian independence and summarized the work of the Council and the UN Secretary General to achieve that goal.

In letters dated March 25 and March 31 respectively, the Permanent Representatives of Gabon and Zimbabwe, on behalf of the UN African Group requested a formal Security Council debate on Namibia. (The last such debate had taken place on November 15, 1985.) The debate opened on April 6 and unfolded over the course of eight consecutive UN Security Council meetings lasting until April 9. A total of 63 speakers took part. All condemned South Africa's continued failure to implement resolution 435 and many called for the imposition of mandatory comprehensive sanctions against South Africa as a means to accelerate the process of granting independence to Namibia. Some speakers were critical of the United States and other members of the Contact Group (Canad[illegible]rance, Federal Republic of Germany, and the United Kingdom), which has played a mediating role in efforts to resolve the Namibia question.

On April 7 the NAM members of the Council tabled a draft resolution that strongly condemned South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia and also imposed nonspecific comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa in terms of Chapter VII of the UN Charter. The Security Council voted on this draft April 9. The vote was 9 to 3 (U.S.), with 3 abstentions. The United Kingdom joined the United States in voting against the draft resolution, thus constituting a double veto.

In his explanation of vote of April 9, the U.S. Permanent Representative Ambassador Vernon A. Walters, declared that South Africa had no right to be in Namibia. Ambassador Walters reiterated the U.S. position on the linkage between the attainment of independence by Namibia and the withdrawal of foreign forces from Angola. He emphasized once again that, as in the case of the Security Council debate on Apartheid less than 2 months earlier, the United States remained flatly opposed to mandatory sanctions. The U.S.

position was, rather, that "each member nation should remain free to enact—or to alter—the policies it deems most appropriate, including sanctions, as we all pursue our common goal of bringing independence to Namibia as rapidly and peacefully as possible." Referring to a request by the Multi-Party Conference (MPC) of Namibia to participate in the Security Council debate, Ambassador Walters noted that under Rule 39 of its procedures the Security Council should grant sympathetic consideration to any person with information to supply about matters at hand. In the present case, the request was defective, however, because it was submitted by the Secretariat of the MPC. The MPC Secretariat comprised the so-called Transitional Government of National Unity in Namibia, an entity whose existence the Security Council had earlier declared to be null and void.

On August 26 the date of the annual commemoration of Namibia Day by the UN Council for Namibia, the President of the Security Council issued a statement that reaffirmed the Council's "continued commitment to discharge its responsibility for the people of Namibia." The statement summarized the efforts of both the Security Council and the UN Secretary General in working for Namibian independence since 1978. It concluded by declaring that the UN Security Council remained dedicated to achieving "a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question that will enable the people of Namibia to freely exercise their legitimate right to self-determination and independence at the earliest possible date."

On October 22 Zambia, on behalf of the UN African Group, requested that the Security Council resume formal debate on the question of Namibia. The debate, which encompassed five meetings of the Council, took place on October 28-30. Fifty-five speakers took part. Most called for the immediate implementation of resolution 435 as well as the imposition of mandatory sanctions against South Africa. There were relatively few explicit criticisms of U.S. policy, although some speakers did find fault with the U.S. position on Namibia-Angola linkage. Addressing the Council on October 29, the permanent representative of South Africa maintained that his government remained committed to resolution 435, but that the obstacle to its implementation was the refusal of Angola to address regional security concerns.

On October 30 the NAM members of the Council tabled a draft resolution that strongly condemned South Africa for its continued illegal occupation of Namibia and its refusal to comply with relevant resolutions of the Security Council. The draft authorized the UN Secretary General "to proceed to arrange a ceasefire between South Africa and the South West African People's Organization in order to undertake administrative and other practical steps necessary for the emplacement of the United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG)." The draft went on to urge all UN members to assist the Secretary General in the implementation of the draft resolution and requested that he present a progress report to the Security Council "as soon as possible." The Security Council adopted this draft by a vote of 14 to 0, with 1 abstention (U.S.) on October 30. (Resolution 601.)

In his explanation of vote, the U.S. Representative, Ambassador Herbert S. Okun, reiterated the U.S. position that South Africa was illegally occupying Namibia and had no right to be in that country. He briefly summarized the progress made, through negotiations in which the United States had been a party, in clarifying the procedural technicalities for implementation of Security Council resolution 435. Okun emphasized, however, that "without a political settlement that addresses the security concerns of both Angola and South Africa, the implementation of 435 will not, in fact, be achieved." In the U.S. view, it was "unrealistic and inappropriate for the Council to ask the Secretary General to proceed with the final procedural steps" of resolution 435 prior to the attainment of an agreed political settlement based on the withdrawal of all foreign forces from both Angola and Namibia. It was for this reason that the United States had abstained on resolution 601.

In closing, Ambassador Okun restated the U.S. position that the Security Council should not give favorable consideration to a request to participate in the debate made by a representative of the so-called Transitional Government of National Unity of Namibia, since the Council had earlier declared the existence of that body to be null and void.

## General Assembly Consideration

The General Assembly considered the question of Namibia at six meetings on November 4-6, with voting on five resolutions taking place the last day. The Assembly dealt with the issue in plenary, without prior reference to a main committee. The Assembly had before it: the report of the United Nations Council for Namibia* (containing the texts of five draft resolutions recommended by that body); the report of the Special Committee on the Situation with Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples; the report of the Secretary General; and the Report of the Fourth Committee. A total of 112 national delegations took part in the 3-day debate, as did observers from the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), and the Islamic Conference.

All speakers called for Namibian independence in terms of Security Council resolution 435, with the vast majority condemning South Africa for noncompliance with this and other resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. Less than one-quarter of all speakers explicitly endorsed SWAPO as the "sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people." Specific criticism of the United States was infrequent. Some 20speakers rejected the U.S. position on the linkage between independence for Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola, but not all of these mentioned the United States directly. Several speakers suggested that if the Security Council continued to be unable to secure the independence of Namibia, the General Assembly should find a way to take action in terms of the UN Charter.

---

*The General Assembly established the United Nations Council for Namibia in 1967 as the only legal authority to administer the territory until independence. The 31 members in 1987 were: Algeria, Angola, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Cyprus, Egypt, Finland, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Liberia, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Senegal, Turkey, U.S.S.R., Venezuela, Yugoslavia, and Zambia. In addition, the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) have observer status in the UN Council for Namibia.

Name-calling in Namibia resolutions, which had been a major concern of the U.S. delegation at the 41st General Assembly in 1986, was nearly eliminated in 1987. In 1986 the original versions of draft resolutions on Namibia had contained 10 pejorative references to the United States and one criticism of Israel before these were all eliminated by separate paragraph votes demanded by the U.S. delegation. In contrast, the five Namibia resolutions tabled in 1987 contained no explicit criticism of the United States, although one such reference did apply to the Federal Republic of Germany (calling upon it to discontinue development aid and assistance programs to illegally occupied Namibia).

The first resolution, entitled "Situation in Namibia Resulting from the Illegal Occupation of the Territory by South Africa," was adopted by a vote of 131 to 0, with 24 abstentions (U.S.). It declares that "South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia, its defiance of the resolutions of the United Nations, its brutal repression of the Namibian people, its acts of destabilization and aggression against independent African states and its policies of Apartheid constitute a threat to international peace and security." The resolution condemns "linkage" and "constructive engagement" and "urges governments which have in the past used their veto or cast negative votes in the Security Council in regard to the question of the imposition of comprehensive and mandatory sanctions against South Africa to support and respond positively to the international call to isolate racist South Africa." It also "strongly condemns the activities of all foreign economic interests operating in Namibia which are illegally exploiting the resources of the territory." (Resolution 42/14 A.)

The second resolution, entitled "Implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978)," was adopted by a vote of 130 to 0, with 24 abstentions (U.S.). It reiterates that Security Council resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) "constitute the only internationally accepted basis for a peaceful settlement of the question of Namibia and demands their immediate and unconditional implementation." The resolution reaffirms the inalienable right of the Namibian people to self-determination and national independence. It "firmly rejects and condemns the persistent attempt by South Africa to establish a 'linkage' or 'parallelism' between the independence of Namibia and any extraneous or irrelevant issues, in particular the presence of Cuban forces in Angola." The resolution "strongly rejects the policies of 'constructive engagement' and 'linkage' " and also "strongly condemns the use of the veto in the Security Council . . . by some of its Western permanent members, as a result of which the Council was prevented from taking effective measures under Chapter VII of the Charter." (Resolution 42/14 B.)

The third resolution, entitled "Program of Work of the United Nations Council for Namibia," was adopted by a vote of 149 to 0, with 6 abstentions (U.S.). The resolution approves the report of the UN Council for Namibia, including the recommendations therein, and decides to make "adequate financial provision" for their implementation. It requests that all UN member states cooperate fully with the Council for Namibia and decides that "Namibia, represented by the Council for Namibia, shall participate as a full member in all conferences and meetings organized by the United Nations." The resolution also sets out several consultative, review and operational tasks for the Council of Namibia to undertake. (Resolution 42/14 C.)

The fourth resolution, entitled "Dissemination of Information and Mobilization of International Public Opinion in Support of the Immediate Independence of Namibia," was adopted by a vote of 133 to 0, with 22 abstentions (U.S.). It outlines a broad program for the UN Council for Namibia, in collaboration with the Department of Public Information of the UN Secretariat and with SWAPO, to "increase the awareness of the international community of the direct responsibility of the United Nations over Namibia and the continued occupation of that territory by the racist regime of South Africa." The resolution allocates $500,000 to the UN Council for Namibia, to be used for a program of cooperation with nongovernmental organizations. It also urges such organizations to "increase the awareness of their national communities and legislative bodies concerning South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia." (Resolution 42/14 D.)

The fifth and last resolution, entitled "United Nations Fund for Namibia," was adopted by a vote of 149 to 0, with 5 abstentions (U.S.). It states that the UN Fund for Namibia, including the trust funds for the Nationhood Program and the UN Institute for Namibia (UNIN), should be the primary source of development assistance to Namibians. The resolution allocates $1.5 million to the UN Fund for Namibia from the UN's 1988 regular budget. It requests the UN Commissioner for Namibia to formulate, in consultation with SWAPO, "assistance projects to the Namibian people to be cofinanced by governments and nongovernmental organizations." It expresses appreciation to bodies within the UN system that have contributed to the Nationhood Program for Namibia, and calls upon them to continue their participation in the program. It also commends UNIN for "the effectiveness of its training programs for Namibians and its research activities on Namibia." (Resolution 42/14 E.)

In her explanation of vote, the U.S. Representative, Ambassador Patricia M. Byrne, reiterated that South Africa had no right to be in Namibia, and that the United States was totally committed to the goal of Namibian independence through implementation of Security Council resolution 435. She noted that one cause for guarded optimism was the resumption, after a hiatus of almost 2 years, of U.S.-Angolan discussions on a regional political settlement for southern Africa. Unfortunately, in the U.S. view, the five Namibia resolutions before the Assembly did not reflect this progress, although the United States did acknowledge the absence of direct name-calling in them. Ambassador Byrne said that because of its active involvement in efforts to achieve a negotiated settlement the United States, together with other members of the Contact Group, would follow the traditional practice of abstaining on the annual Namibia resolutions in the General Assembly.

Nevertheless, she went on, the resolutions contained language with which the United States disagreed and against which it had voted in other contexts. Such language included: the repeated references to SWAPO as the "sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people"; the endorsement of armed struggle; the rejection of the U.S. position on the linkage between implementation of resolution 435 and the withdrawal of foreign forces from both Namibia and Angola; the condemnation of "constructive engagement"; and the call for comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa. The United States also took exception to the fact that the second resolution set a deadline of September 29, 1988, for Security Council action, after which the General Assembly was to consider necessary action of its own.

In a related development, Bernt Carlsson of Sweden assumed office as UN Commissioner for Namibia on July 1, 1987. The General Assembly had elected him by consensus the preceding December to succeed Brajesh Mishra of India in that post.

## PUERTO RICO

Cuba, as in recent years, sponsored in the Committee of 24 (decolonization) a resolution that "reaffirmed" Puerto Rico's right to independence, an option that Puerto Ricans repeatedly have declined to exercise. The resolution this year attracted only 9 votes, passing by a vote of 9 to 1, with 10 abstentions, and 4 absent or not voting. Previous cosponsor Venezuela abstained and suggested that the C-24 defer discussion of the issue. The Fourth Committee opted not to refer the resolution to the Plenary, although C-24 results appear in the Fourth Committee report to the UN General Assembly. The Assembly last voted overwhelmingly in 1982 against a move to inscribe Puerto Rico on its agenda.

The United States opposes discussion of Puerto Rico in the C-24 because in 1953, General Assembly resolution 748 removed Puerto Rico from the list of non-self-governing territories, following the decision of the Puerto Rican people that Puerto Rico should become a U.S. Commonwealth. The General Assembly action recognized that Puerto Ricans had exercised their right to self-determination, and that, as a self-governing entity, Puerto Rico was no longer a proper subject for UN consideration under the UN Charter.

## WESTERN SAHARA

The conflict in the Western Sahara dates from 1976. When Spain transferred administrative control of the territory to Morocco and Mauritania, the POLISARIO Front launched a guerrilla war against Mauritania and Morocco to obtain independence for the entire territory. Mauritania withdrew from the territory in 1979. Morocco then extended its territorial claims to include the one-third of the Sahara formerly claimed by Mauritania, and the guerrilla war between the POLISARIO Front and Morocco continued. The U.S. position has been to support a peaceful settlement acceptable to all parties under the auspices of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the United Nations.

At the 42nd General Assembly, the Western Sahara issue was raised initially in the Fourth Committee where, for the second year in a row, only Algeria introduced a resolution. (Before 1986 both Algeria and Morocco had annually tabled resolutions on Western Sahara.) The Algerian draft resolution had 42 other sponsors. Its essential element was a call for Morocco and the POLISARIO Front, which it described as "the two parties to the conflict," to begin direct negotiations as soon as possible "with a view to bringing about a cease-fire to create the necessary conditions for a peaceful and fair referendum for self-determination of the people of Western Sahara, a referendum without any administrative or military constraints, under the auspices of the Organization of African States and the United Nations."

The Algerian draft resolution also noted with appreciation the continuing joint good offices role of the Chairman of the OAU and the UN Secretary General, inviting them "to continue to exert effort to persuade the two parties to the conflict" to enter negotiations in the shortest possible time. This draft closely resembled the Western Sahara resolution adopted by the General Assembly the previous year (Resolution 41/16). New, however, was an acknowledgement of the joint decision of the OAU Chairman and the UN Secretary General to send a technical mission to Western Sahara for the purpose of collecting information relevant to the arrangement of a cease-fire and referendum. (A UN technical team visited Western Sahara for this purpose on November 20-30, 1987.)

The Fourth Committee voted on the Algerian draft resolution on October 28. In explaining the U.S. decision to abstain, Ambassador Patricia M. Byrne described the resolution as moderately better than the one of the previous year, especially in its reference to the continuing good offices role of the Secretary General and the dispatch of a technical mission to Western Sahara. In the U.S. view, the resolution was still unbalanced, however, in that it did not accommodate understandable concerns of Morocco. It also failed to reflect the progress made by the Secretary General during the past year in his contacts with Algeria, Morocco, and the POLISARIO Front, and (by calling on him to promote direct negotiations between Morocco and the POLISARIO) appeared to circumscribe the Secretary General's mandate. The Algerian draft resolution passed in the Fourth Committee by a vote of 93 to 0, with 49 abstentions (U.S.).

The General Assembly plenary took up the Algerian resolution on December 4, and adopted it by a vote of 93 to 0, with 50 abstentions (U.S.). (Resolution 42/78.)

## NEW CALEDONIA

The 42nd UN General Assembly considered a resolution (42/79) on December 4 reaffirming the inalienable right of the people of New Caledonia to self-determination and independence, calling on France to supply information on New Caledonia as a non-self-governing territory, and regretting its failure to comply with earlier requests to do so. The resolution further requested the Committee of 24 (the Special Committee on Decolonization) to continue examination of the question of New Caledonia at its next session, including the possible dispatch of a visiting mission to New Caledonia at an appropriate time and in consultation with the administering power, and then to report to the 43rd General Assembly.

Although French policy in New Caledonia came in for considerable criticism from many delegations, the final vote of 69 to 29, with 47 abstentions (U.S.) was 20 fewer affirmative votes than a slightly different New Caledonia resolution (41/41 A) received in 1986. The considerably weaker showing of support is attributed to vigorous French lobbying efforts. The previous resolution, passed by a vote of 89 to 24, with 34 abstentions (U.S.) at the 41st General Assembly, reinscribed New Caledonia on the list of non-self-governing territories. The seven nations of the South Pacific Forum (Australia, New Zealand, Papua Guinea, Western Samoa, Solomon Islands, and Vanuatu) were the chief sponsors of both resolutions dealing with New Caledonia.

The United States abstained again in 1987 on the General Assembly resolution dealing with New Caledonia. The United States decided that its support for a peaceful settlement of the future political status of New Caledonia required it not to take sides on the resolution.

New Caledonia is a French overseas territory located in the Pacific Ocean and has a population of about 150,000. It was acquired by France in 1853. New Caledonia was inscribed on the original list of non-self-governing territories in 1946 following the transmission by the French Government of information on the territory pursuant to Article 73(e) of the UN Charter. Beginning in 1947, however, France declined to provide further information to the United Nations regarding New Caledonia.

## OTHER QUESTIONS

### Fourth Committee Resolutions

The Fourth Committee considered its standard agenda items in the usual one month (September 23–October 28), virtually completing its work on October 28 by taking action on 19 draft resolutions and decisions. The Committee adopted a resolution on reporting information on non-self-governing territories by a vote of 134 to 0, with four abstentions (U.S.). A resolution dealing with the role of the specialized agencies in decolonization was approved by a vote of 119 to 3 (U.S.) with 25 abstentions after an Israeli motion supported by the United States to delete name-calling from the resolution failed to pass. Resolutions and decisions dealing with 12 small territories, including American Samoa, Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands, as well as with the UN Educational and Training Program for Southern Africa, and with offers by member states of study and training facilities for inhabitants of non-self-governing territories were passed without a vote. The Committee adopted by consensus resolutions and decisions on all of the British territories except St. Helena. After a British motion to delete a critical reference to military facilities on Ascension Island failed, the resolution was adopted by a vote of 112 to 2 (U.S. and U.K.) with 29 abstentions.

The Fourth Committee also considered the agenda item titled "Activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in Namibia and in all other territories under colonial domination and efforts to eliminate colonialism, Apartheid, and racial discrimination in southern Africa." On October 7, following debate on the item, the Fourth Committee adopted a resolution on "foreign economic activities" by a vote of 93 to 8 (U.S.) with 14 abstentions and, concurrently, a decision on "military activities and arrangements by colonial powers in territories" by a vote of 90 to 11 (U.S.) with 14 abstentions.

The United States has consistently voted against Fourth Committee resolutions dealing with "foreign economic activities" because these resolutions make outmoded and erroneous assumptions with regard to the activities of multinational corporations. In addition, the U.S. Government does not view the activities of foreign economic entities as significant impediments to self-determination. The United States opposed the decision on military activities because the United States does not view the presence of military facilities and personnel in a non-self-governing territory to necessarily pose a major impediment to the exercise of self-determination by the people there.

Continuing the practice of the past 3 years, the United States was not singled out for condemnation in any of these C-24 drafted resolutions. The Fourth Committee reconvened for one day on November 17 to hear petitions relating to the Falklands/Malvinas Islands.

## Plenary Action

Plenary debate on decolonization, including reports of the C-24 and the Fourth Committee, took place on December 3-4. Only 25 delegations made statements, compared with 27 last year. In addition, the plenary debate provoked only one right of reply, in contrast to eight in 1986. The resolution on "foreign economic interests" (Resolution 42/74) was approved by a vote of 133 to 10 (U.S.) with 12 abstentions and the declaration "military activities" by a margin of 131 to 12 (U.S.), with 13 abstentions. (Decision 42/417.) The resolution reporting information from non-self-governing territories was adopted by a vote of 154 to 0, with 3 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 42/73.) The resolution on the role of the specialized agencies in decolonization was approved by a vote of 130 to 3 (U.S.), with 23 abstentions. (Resolution 42/75.) The United States opposed this resolution because it included name-calling against the state of Israel. The plenary adopted, without a vote, the same 14 draft resolutions and decisions that the Fourth Committee had earlier adopted without a vote. The resolution on St. Helena was passed by a vote of 119 to 2 (U.S. and U.K.) with 30 abstentions. (Decision 42/420.)

On December 4, the plenary adopted the omnibus resolution on implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by a vote of 131 to 2 (U.S. and U.K.) with 7 abstentions. (Resolution 42/71.) The United States opposed this resolution because it contained a general condemnation of foreign economic activities and called for the withdrawal of foreign military installations from non-self-governing territories. The plenary also approved on the same date a resolution on the dissemination of information and decolonization by a margin of 135 to 2 (U.S. and U.K.) with 6 abstentions. (Resolution 42/72.) The United States opposed this for budgetary reasons.

## Part 4

# Legal Developments

## INTRODUCTION

Significant legal issues on both substantive and procedural matters frequently arise in connection with U.S. participation in a wide variety of UN activities and in nearly all international organizations. Many of these legal matters are discussed in other parts of this report in the context of the underlying issues or particular international organizations to which they relate, including review of the UN Charter; uses of outer space; international human rights; International Labor Organization, International Civil Aviation Organization, and UNESCO matters; UN administration and budget; and UN trusteeship issues. Part 4, therefore, deals separately with 1987 activities of an exclusively legal character, such as those of the International Court of Justice, the International Law Commission, the UN Commission on International Trade Law, the Sixth (Legal) Committee of the General Assembly, and special international conferences or committees that consider legal questions involving the drafting of certain treaties or the relations between the United States as the host country on one hand and the United Nations and missions to the United Nations on the other. As indicated above, drafting exercises concerning international human rights instruments are discussed in Part 2 of this report.

## INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

The item entitled "Measures to Prevent International Terrorism Which Endangers Innocent Human Lives or Jeopardizes Fundamental Freedoms, and Study of the Underlying Cause of those Forms of Terrorism and Acts of Violence Which Lie in Misery, Frustration, Grievance, and Despair and Which Cause Some People to Sacrifice Human Lives, Including Their Own, in an Attempt to Effect Radical Change," is considered biennially, and was on the agenda for the General Assembly's 42nd session. The Sixth Committee considered the item at seven meetings, October 21-28 and December 1.

Debate focused on condemnation of terrorist acts, steps that could be taken to combat terrorism, a Syrian proposal to convene an international conference to define terrorism and to differentiate it from actions taken in the context of a struggle for national liberation and a proposal by the Soviet Union to reestablish the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Terrorism.

In the U.S. statement to the Legal Committee, Congressman George William Crockett, Jr., stated:

> Acts of terrorism threaten the very existence of our international community. . . . At its fortieth session, the General Assembly unequivocally condemned as criminal all acts, methods and practices of terrorism wherever and by whomever committed. This broad condemnation built upon such earlier achievements as the conventions relating to interference with civil aviation, . . . the Protection of Diplomats, the Convention Against Hostage-taking and other United Nations actions. . . . This firm base of unequivocal condemnation and positive cooperation should be built upon and intensified. It is important that we not allow that firm base to be eroded by pursuing unnecessary conceptual problems on which agreement will elude us. . . . We also must not allow ourselves to be misled into imagining some dichotomy between opposition to terrorism on the one hand and support for self-determination on the other. My delegation rejects totally the implicit suggestion that there is any inconsistency between combatting terrorism and supporting self-determination. We have not forgotten our origins as a nation which fought for its independence. The issue is not whether non-peaceable means are ever appropriate but whether there are certain means so heinous that they are never tolerable; acts which nothing can justify. . . . Finally, there is the risk of confusing this item with the question of the scope and binding nature of Article 2, paragraph 4 of the Charter. The rules concerning the use of force by States are relatively clear. Nothing is added to the meaning of Article 2, paragraph 4 of the Charter or, for that matter, Article 39, by seeking within the ambit of the item before us, to apply the term terrorism to State action. The very title of the item before us with its recitation of causes leaves no room for doubt that the item was never intended to apply to acts of violence by States. . . . Acts of violence by individuals or groups, informal or otherwise, which affect nationals of another State are the proper scope of the item before us.

The Sixth Committee had before it three draft resolutions: 1 sponsored by the United Kingdom and 20 other countries from Western European and Others Group, 1 by Zimbabwe, and 1 by Yugoslavia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia and Malta.

A text including elements from the draft sponsored by the United Kingdom and other Western Europeans and from the Yugoslav and Zimbabwe drafts was adopted by a vote of 128 to 1 (Israel) with 1 abstention (U.S.). The draft resolution reaffirmed the 1985 resolution 40/61, which unequivocally condemned as criminal "all acts, methods, and practices of terrorism wherever and by whomever committed," took no action on the Syrian proposal to convene an international conference to distinguish terrorism from the actions of national liberation movements, or the Soviet proposal to reconvene the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Terrorism. In explaining the U.S. abstention, the U.S. Representative praised the reiteration of the unequivocal condemnation of terrorism, the call for international antiterrorism cooperation, and the reference to work of specialized agencies (e.g., ICAO, IMO) in the draft resolution. However, the U.S. Representative criticized operative paragraph 14 of the draft resolution as gratuitous and, in the context, too readily susceptible of misinterpretation by the ill-intention or ill-informed. Paragraph 14 provided that "nothing in the resolution could in any way prejudice the right to self-determination, freedom and independence . . . of peoples forcibly deprived of that right . . . particularly peoples under colonial and racist regimes and foreign occupation . . . nor . . . the right of these peoples to struggle to this end and to seek and receive support." Finland, on behalf of the Nordic countries, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and Uruguay made statements after the vote critical of the inclusion of paragraph 14 in the resolution.

The General Assembly adopted the draft resolution without change at its 94th meeting on December 7 (Resolution 42/159) by a vote of 153 to 2 (Israel, United States), with 1 abstention. The United States, applauded the reaffirmation of resolution 40/61, the unequivocal condemnation of all acts of terrorism and the encouragement to further action by the specialized agencies. However, it determined that the inclusion of the reference to national liberation movements in this resolution, while acceptable in other contexts, unacceptably distracted from the main purpose of the resolution.

## INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE (ICJ)

The International Court of Justice (ICJ) is the principal judicial organ of the United Nations. The Court's main functions are to decide cases submitted to it by states and to give advisory opinions on legal questions at the request of international organizations authorized pursuant to the Statute of the Court and the UN Charter.

The Court is composed of 15 judges, no 2 of whom may be nationals of the same state, elected by the UN General Assembly and the Security Council, voting independently, from a list of persons nominated by national groups on the Permanent Court of Arbitration. The electors are mandated to bear in mind the qualifications of the individual candidates and the need for the Court as a whole to represent the main forms of civilization and the principal legal systems of the world. Court members are elected for 9-year terms, with one-third of the total number of judges elected every 3 years. An election was held on November 11, 1987. Judges Roberto Ago of Italy, Mohammed Bedjaoui of Algeria, Stephen M. Schwebel of the United States and Nikolai Tarassov of the U.S.S.R. were reelected. Judge Mohamed Shahabuddeen of Guyana replaced Judge Jose Sette-Camara of Brazil.

The Court submitted to the 42nd General Assembly a brief report on its activities from August 1, 1986, to July 31, 1987. The report contained information on the Court's composition, jurisdiction, judicial work, administration, and publications. The General Assembly took note of the report on October 15. (Adopted without a vote, Decision 42/405.) During the debate in the Sixth Committee, the Soviet Representative proposed that greater use be made of the ICJ and that the major powers consider accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court. The U.S. Representative, Robert Rosenstock, replied (in part):

> The United States would be pleased to consider specific proposals by the Soviet

**Union providing for greater use of the Court, particularly by the major powers. Indeed, the United States would consider joining with the Soviet Union, or any other state, in proposals for expanding the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court in appropriate cases. In the meantime, the Soviet Union could significantly enhance the role of the Court in the peaceful resolution of disputes if it were itself to begin to withdraw its reservations regarding the jurisdiction of the Court in some of the many multilateral treaties to which it is a party.**

### Nicaragua v. United States of America

The United States continued to maintain that the Court's decision that it had jurisdiction in the case was "clearly and manifestly erroneous as to both fact and law" and that the Court was without jurisdiction to hear the dispute.

On September 7 the Agent of Nicaragua stated to the Court that no agreement had been reached as to the matter of reparations and that Nicaragua requested the Court to make the necessary orders for the conduct of the case.

On November 13 the Legal Adviser's Office of the Department of State informed the Registrar that the United States remained of the view that the Nicaraguan Application was inadmissible.

On November 18 the Court fixed March 29, 1988, as the time limit for Nicaragua to file its Memorial on the question of damages and set July 29, 1988, as the time limit for the filing of a Counter-Memorial by the United States.

### Case Concerning Elettronica Sicula, S.p.A. (ELSI) United States v. Italy

On February 6 the United States filed an Application with the Court instituting a contentious proceeding against Italy. The United States is asking the Court to resolve a longstanding commercial dispute with the Government of Italy in accordance with the U.S.-Italy 1948 Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation (FCN). The case is based on actions taken by Italian authorities in the late 1960's against a local subsidiary of two U.S. corporations—Raytheon Company and Machlett Laboratories. The United States and Italy have been unable to resolve this dispute through diplomatic channels. The Court has designated a five Judge Chamber to determine the case. It had jurisdiction over the case under Article 36(1) of its Rules, pursuant to the compromissory clause of the FCN Treaty (Article XXVI). The United States filed a Memorial in the case on May 15. Italy filed a Counter-Memorial on November 16.

## INTERNATIONAL LAW COMMISSION

Pursuant to General Assembly Resolution 174(II) of November 21, 1947, the International Law Commission (ILC) was established in 1948 to promote the codification and progressive development of international law. The membership, which was increased from 25 to 34 during the 36th General Assembly, consists of legal experts serving in their individual capacities and elected by the General Assembly for 5-year terms. Stephen Conolley McCaffrey of the United States was elected on November 23, 1981, for a term which began on January 1, 1982. The quinquennial election for members of the ILC was held in the General Assembly on November 14, 1986. Mr. McCaffrey was reelected.

The Commission studies topics it has determined are suitable for codification, or that other UN bodies, usually the General Assembly, refer to it. Its normal procedure is to select one of its members (designated a "special rapporteur") to prepare reports on each of the topics and, after discussion, to draft articles which are acted on by the full Commission. Each year, the Commission reports to the General Assembly on the articles it has adopted during that year's session. It reconsiders the articles in light of government comments, and then adopts final texts which it forwards to the General Assembly. When the Assembly receives a set of draft articles, generally in the form of a proposed convention, it may convene a diplomatic conference to consider adoption of a convention, review the articles itself, note them, or remand them to the Commission for further study.

## Work of the Commission's 38th Session

The ILC held its 39th session in Geneva from May 4 to July 27. It elected Mr. McCaffrey of the United States as its Chairman.

The Commission had on its agenda seven substantive topics: jurisdictional immunities of States and their property, status of the diplomatic courier and the diplomatic bag not accompanied by diplomatic courier, state responsibility, the Draft Code of Offenses against the Peace and Security of Mankind, international liability for injurious consequences arising out of acts not prohibited by international law, non-navigational uses of international watercourses, and relations between states and international organizations.

The Commission did not consider jurisdictional immunities of states or the diplomatic bag because it is awaiting comments from governments on draft articles on these two topics. It did not consider state responsibility because a new Special Rapporteur had been appointed who had not yet had an opportunity to become familiar with the subject.

With respect to the four items it did consider at this session, the Commission took the following actions:

— Draft Code of Offenses: The ILC provisionally adopted Articles 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6. Articles 4 and 7-11 of the 11-article draft proposed by the Special

Rapporteur are before the drafting committee.

— International liability for injurious consequences arising out of acts not prohibited by international law: The ILC discussed the six-draft articles proposed by the Special Rapporteur, but reached no decisions on the basis of the discussion, the Special Rapporteur indicated he would introduce revised texts at the next session.

— Non-navigational uses of international watercourses: The ILC provisionally adopted Articles 2-7 and invited the views of governments on those articles.

— Relations between states and international organizations: The ILC began consideration of the status and immunities of international organizations, their officials, experts and other persons engaged in their activities not being representatives of states. The Special Rapporteur presented an outline of the topics he intends to research, which was approved.

## General Assembly Action

The Sixth Committee of the 42nd General Assembly considered the Commission's report at 16 meetings from October 29 to November 25. On November 25 Mexico introduced a draft resolution on behalf of 32 cosponsors. The draft concerned the Commission's report and *inter alia* recommended the Commission should continue its work on all the topics in its current program; reaffirmed its previous decisions concerning the increased role of the Codification Division of the Office of Legal Affairs of the Secretariat; and confirmed that the ILC should maintain the usual duration of its session. The draft was approved by the Committee on November 25 and by the General Assembly on December 7, in both instances by consensus. (Resolution 42/156.)

The U.S. Representative, Mary V. Mochary, commented on the diplomatic bag and sovereign immunity issues, stating with respect to the diplomatic bag:

> We believe that it is important not to overlook the value of the existing regime. The use of the diplomatic bag with the protection it provides to correspondence and other items transported in the bag for the official use of the mission has been and remains vital to the operation of all of our diplomatic missions, and, therefore, to the efficient conduct of our foreign relations. The basic regime provided in Article 27 of the diplomatic relations convention is in place, and reflects a practice extending back for centuries. Moreover, it has been adapted by the international community and particular states as the circumstances have required. Attempting in these articles to deal with the special features of the different adaptations of that regime in other contexts complicates the law in this area, diminishes the flexibility inherent in separate but parallel approaches to the regime of the pouch in different contexts, and is unnecessary.

With respect to sovereign immunities, she said:

> The United States continues to vigorously support the efforts of the Commission to codify the law in this area, and hopes that the Commission will be able to reach agreement on articles that reflect the full scope of the evolution of the restrictive theory of law in this area. Nonetheless, in view of the continuing controversy generated by the draft articles, the U.S. Government believes it may be wise for the Commission not to rush to conclude its work on these articles. Indeed, approval of draft articles that disagree with the practices and policies of a large number of states could retard progress in reaching a consensus in this area through an evolving practice. The Commission may want to consider the desirability of diverting its focus temporarily away from the details of the articles and toward a detailed analysis of the different practices of States—not just record their statutes or agreements in this area—and the impact that those practices have had on the relations among the affected States. Indeed, such a study might help to foster consensus in this area.

## UN COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE LAW

The UN Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL), established by the General Assembly in 1966, continued at its 20th session and in the meetings of its working groups to do serious and professional legal work to unify and harmonize the law of international trade. The Commission is composed of 36 member states elected by the General Assembly for a term of 6 years.* Additional states participate in the work of the Commission as observers.

### Work of the Commission's 20th Session

The 1987 session of UNCITRAL took place in Vienna on July 20 to August 14. The United States was represented by Peter H. Pfund, Assistant Legal Adviser for Private International Law, Department of State, Professor John A. Spanogle, Jr., Faculty of Law at the State University of New York at Buffalo, and Professor Don Wallace, Georgetown University Law Center, Washington, D.C.

The Commission devoted most of its time to review of the draft convention on international bills of exchange and international promissory notes. The Commission had devoted 15 meetings of its Working Group on International Negotiable Instruments and most of the time of three prior sessions of the Commission itself to this project, and the hope was that the Commission would complete its work on this project and be able to transmit the draft Convention to the General Assembly after the 20th session of UNCITRAL.

Upon completion of the review of draft articles, the Commission adopted a decision by which it submitted the draft Convention to the General Assembly with a recommendation that it should consider it with a view to its adoption or other action to be taken.

---

*Members in 1987 were Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, France, German Democratic Republic, Hungary, India, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Libya, Mexico, Netherlands, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Tanzania, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, and Yugoslavia.

The Commission adopted the UNCITRAL legal guide on drawing up international contracts for the construction of industrial works. The United States supported adoption of the legal guide. The Commission also requested the Secretary General to take effective measures for the widespread distribution and promotion of the use of the legal guide.

The Commission noted the progress made by the Secretariat in its preparatory work in the area of international procurement, which was undertaken as a priority topic at its 19th session.

The Commission noted the progress being made by one of its working groups on the preparation of uniform rules on the liability of operators of transport terminals.

On the general coordination of work, the Commission heard reports by the observers from the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law, the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, and the Council of Europe.

The Commission had before it a report on the legal implications of automatic data processing, which described the results of a meeting hosted by the Commission Secretariat, which had been attended by eight organizations active in the field. The report contained information on the work done or to be undertaken by several other organizations. The Commission approved the course of action proposed in the report.

The Commission considered the status of signatures, ratifications, accessions, and approvals of conventions that were the outcome of its work.

The Commission considered a draft Medium Term Plan for 1990-1995, and was in agreement that an increased priority should be given to efforts by the Secretariat to promote the adoption and use of the texts emanating from the work of the Commission and to training and assistance activities.

## General Assembly Action

The Sixth Committee of the 42nd General Assembly considered the report of UNCITRAL at four meetings from September 22 to 25, and at two meetings on November 23 and 25. As in the past, the U.S. Representative, Mr. Robert Rosenstock, expressed support for the proposed future work of the Commission and the satisfaction of the United States at the quality of the work of the UNCITRAL Secretariat.

On November 23 Austria introduced a draft General Assembly resolution in the Sixth Committee, eventually sponsored by a number of other countries, on the Report of UNCITRAL on the work of its 20th session, *inter alia*, noting the completion by the Commission of the draft convention on international bills of exchange and international promissory notes. The resolution noted the adoption of the legal guide on drawing up international contracts for the construction of industrial works and recommended that all efforts should be made so that the legal guide becomes generally known and available. It invited states to consider ratifying or acceding to a number of UNCITRAL prepared Conventions. It also reaffirmed the importance of the work of the Commission concerned with training and assistance.

The draft resolution was approved in Committee, and the General Assembly on December 7 adopted the resolution without a vote. (Resolution 42/152.)

On November 23 Austria also introduced a draft General Assembly resolution in the Sixth Committee, cosponsored by a number of countries, including the United States, to adopt the draft convention on international bills of exchange and international promissory notes and to open it for signature on January 1, 1989. On November 25, France introduced, on behalf of a number of other countries, amendments to that resolution which requested the Secretary General to ask countries instead to submit observations and proposals on the draft Convention for circulation to all member states by June 30, 1988. It also called for consideration, at the 43rd General Assembly, of the draft convention with a view to its adoption, and to create to this end, in the framework of the Sixth Committee, a working group that will meet at the beginning of the session to consider the observations and proposals made by states. The amendments were adopted by votes and the draft resolution as amended was adopted in the Sixth Committee by a vote of 80 to none, with 46 (U.S.) abstentions. The General Assembly on December 7 adopted a resolution by a vote of 114 to none, with 40 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 42/153.)

## DRAFT CODE OF OFFENSES AGAINST THE PEACE AND SECURITY OF MANKIND

The General Assembly has been considering this item on and off since 1947 without definitive result. The original impetus for the exercise was an inclination, building on the Nuremberg and Tokyo trials, to draft highly detailed rules, violation of which would constitute criminal behavior. Initial efforts resulted in a draft by the International Law Commission, which did not command sufficient support for final action to be taken. After a hiatus of 20 years, during which the Assembly dealt in other forms with much of the conduct in question, resulting in such instruments as the Genocide Convention and the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in Accordance With the Charter of the United Nations, the Assembly resumed consideration of the item at its 33rd session in 1978.

In the course of the Assembly's consideration of the item in 1978, and from 1980-1985 and in written comments, the United States along with most of the Western European countries welcomed the decision of the International

Law Commission to limit its consideration at this stage to responsibility of individuals rather than states, but expressed great doubt that any useful progress could be made, since, *inter alia,* the project exceeded the clear basis of universal agreement and the issues involved are inextricably linked to the mechanism of international criminal jurisdiction on which progress is most unlikely. Western countries also noted the extent to which much of the original material had in fact been dealt with elsewhere in the interim. Support for the item from some non-aligned countries and the Soviet Union has, however, been sufficient to keep it before the United Nations.

The Sixth Committee considered the item at meetings between October 29 and November 12, and on November 25. On November 25 a draft resolution was introduced by Egypt cosponsored by 24 countries which, *inter alia,* invited the International Law Commission to continue its work with a view to elaborating the Draft Code and decided to include an item in the 43rd provisional agenda entitled "Draft Code of Crimes (sic) Against the Peace and Security of Mankind." The United States joined France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Israel, and the United Kingdom in voting against this resolution on the ground that this item should be considered along with the other work of the International Law Commission.

The resolution was approved by the Sixth Committee by a vote of 107 to 5 (U.S.), with 14 abstentions. The General Assembly adopted the resolution on December 3 by a vote of 136 to 5 (U.S.), with 14 abstentions. (Resolution 42/151.)

## NON-USE OF FORCE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

### Special Committee

The Special Committee on Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Principle of Non-Use of Force in International Relations held its 10th and concluding session in New York from March 9 to 27. Established in 1977 under General Assembly resolution 32/150, the 35-member committee was originally asked to draft a treaty on the nonuse of force in international relations, the peaceful settlement of disputes or such other recommendations as the committee might deem appropriate. The body has met annually since 1978, but was unable to carry out that mandate. A number of states, including the United States, argued that such a treaty would be subversive of the Charter of the United Nations. In 1986 the General Assembly adopted resolution 41/76 which clarified the mandate and decided that the Committee should complete a draft declaration on the enhancement of the effectiveness of the principle of the nonuse of force in international relations.

Pursuant to UN General Assembly resolution 41/76, The Non-Use of Force (NUF) Committee, which operates by consensus, completed work on a draft declaration on the enhancement of the effectiveness of the principle of refraining from the threat or use of force in international relations for submission to the 42nd General Assembly session. By submitting the draft, the committee completed its mandate and will no longer meet.

## General Assembly

The Sixth Committee considered the report of the Non-Use of Force (NUF) Committee at five meetings between October 8-13 and one meeting on November 13. The U.S. Representative, Robert Rosenstock, told the Sixth Committee that the draft declaration was suggestive of what is possible when there is a willingness to cooperate in search for common ground. He applauded the draft declaration's reaffirmation of resolution 2645, which he described as one of the most authoritative expressions by the General Assembly of its view of the content of obligations undertaken by member states.

On November 13 the Sixth Committee approved without a vote a draft resolution sponsored by Italy and five other states. This draft resolution recommended that the General Assembly adopt a slighty modified version of the draft submitted by the NUF committee in its report.

On November 18 the General Assembly adopted the text recommended by the Sixth Committee without a vote. (Resolution 42/22.)

## PROTECTION OF DIPLOMATS

The Sixth Committee considered protection of diplomats at three meetings on September 28-30 and November 13.

On November 13, Norway, on behalf of 19 cosponsors, introduced a draft resolution condemning attacks on diplomats and asking the Secretary General to prepare a report for the Committee's 43rd Session giving information on the state of ratifications and accessions to treaties relevant to the safety of diplomats and on any incidents endangering diplomats reported to him by states. The United States strongly supported the resolution as an important component in the efforts of the organized international community to deal with an aspect of the terrorism problem. The Committee approved the resolution by consensus on November 13, and it was adopted by the General Assembly by consensus on December 3. (Resolution 42/154.)

## INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION AGAINST MERCENARY ACTIVITIES

In resolution 35/48, the General Assembly established an *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Drafting of an International Convention Against the Recruitment, Use, Financing, and Training of Mercenaries. The *Ad Hoc*

Committee was to be composed of 35 member states but currently consists of 34.* At its first session in 1981, the Committee discussed the various issues that must be resolved before an international convention against mercenary activities can be concluded.

During its 1982 session, the Committee had before it draft conventions prepared by Nigeria and France, comments from several member states, and a compilation of international agreements and national legislation relating to mercenary activities. In addition to discussing the draft articles of the Nigerian and French texts and related proposals from other member states, the Committee formed two working groups that used most of the time allocated to the Committee for its 1982 session. Working Group A dealt with issues of definition and the scope of the future convention, and Working Group B addressed all other issues relevant to it. Both Working Groups succeeded in clarifying, and thus simplifying, a number of issues, although some critical ones such as the definition of the term "mercenary" were not resolved. This work was continued during the 1983, 1984, and 1985 sessions. No 1986 session of the *Ad Hoc* Committee was held as a result of the UN financial situation. Negotiations resumed in 1987.

The Sixth Committee considered the item in meetings on October 2-6 and November 23. On November 23 Nigeria introduced a resolution on behalf of 43 cosponsors renewing the mandate of the *Ad Hoc* Committee and inviting it to meet early in 1988 to continue its work. The resolution was approved by the Sixth Committee on November 18 without a vote. The Assembly adopted the resolution on December 7 without a vote. (Resolution 42/155.)

## STRENGTHENING INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

In 1969 the Soviet Union proposed an agenda item for the General Assembly on the "Strengthening of International Security." The Assembly adopted a Soviet-sponsored declaration on this topic in 1970, which touched on the full range of UN activity, including peaceful settlement of disputes, strengthening peacekeeping procedures, disarmament, colonialism, racial discrimination, self-determination, and closing the economic gap between developed and developing countries. Resolutions calling for implementationof this declaration have been considered annually by the General Assembly since 1971. Although the United States voted in favor of the initial declaration, it has often abstained or voted against subsequent resolutions under this agenda item on the grounds that they do not contribute to promoting peace and respect for the principles of the UN Charter. Moreover, some of these resolutions on strengthening international security have contained formulations unacceptable to the United States.

---

*Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bulgaria, Canada, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, France, Federal Republic of Germany, German Democratic Republic, Haiti, India, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Mongolia, Nigeria, Portugal, Senegal, Seychelles, Spain, Suriname, Togo, Turkey, Ukrainian S.S.R., U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Yugoslavia, Zaire, and Zambia.

In recent years, the non-aligned countries have used this agenda item as a vehicle to promote cardinal tenets of non-aligned doctrine such as anticolonialism, the New International Economic Order, support for national liberation movements, and national sovereignty over natural resources. Four draft resolutions were introduced and considered by the First Committee during the period November 19-25 under the agenda item, "Strengthening International Security" (SIS).

On November 25, by a vote of 108 to 1 (U.S.), with 24 abstentions, the Committee adopted Yugoslavia's traditional resolution entitled, "Review of the Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security." The text reflected perceived non-aligned priorities ranging from implementing the recommendations of the Final Document of the First Special Session on Disarmament to the nuclear capability of South Africa. *Inter alia* the resolution noted with concern that the provisions of the SIS Declaration of 1970 had not been fully implemented and urged all states to abide strictly by their obligations under the UN Charter. The resolution was adopted by the General Assembly on December 7 by a vote of 131 to 1 (U.S.), with 23 abstentions. (Resolution 42/92.)

In previous years, the United States had abstained on the resolution in this item. At the 42nd General Assembly, however, as at the 41st, the United States judged that it was compelled to oppose the increasingly objectionable language, which has come to dominate the text, and therefore voted against the resolution. Among the extraneous and tendentious formulations in the resolution to which the United States took particular exception were: the assertion that the superpowers are primarily responsible for a deteriorating international security climate, the implication that the nuclear arms race is being extended into outer space, the linking of disarmament and development, the assertion that the United Nations is an "indispensable forum for negotiations," and the call for support of national liberation movements.

Malta introduced its traditional SIS resolution in the First Committee on the "Strengthening of Security and Cooperation in the Mediterranean Region." The text expressed concern that persistent and increasing tensions in parts of the Mediterranean posed a threat to peace, and reaffirmed that security in the region is closely linked with European security. The resolution emphasized the need to reduce tensions and called for just and viable solutions for existing problems and crises in the region in accordance with the UN Charter and "the withdrawal of foreign forces of occupation and the right of peoples under colonial or foreign domination to self-determination and independence." It also urged all states to cooperate with Mediterranean states to reduce tensions and promote peace, security, and cooperation in the region. The resolution also took note of a proposal to establish "a Mediterranean forum as an interdisciplinary framework for the promotion of cooperation in the region," bringing together not only government representatives but also prominent individuals and participants from scientific, educational, cultural, and other institutions.

As in previous years, the Mediterranean SIS resolution was adopted by the First Committee without a vote on November 25. The plenary likewise adopted it by consensus on December 7. (Resolution 42/90.)

A new element in the Maltese resolution in 1987 was a reference in a preambular paragraph to a June 1987 meeting of non-aligned foreign ministers of the Mediterranean region held at Brioni, Yugoslavia. Although the United States once again joined in the adoption by consensus of the Maltese resolution, the U.S. Representative felt compelled to issue the following explanation of vote to place on the record the reservation of the United States on this particular paragraph:

> The United States in recent years has joined in the traditional consensus adoption of this resolution on strengthening security and cooperation in the Mediterranean. However, the text this year also contains a new element, which creates very real difficulties for my government. I am referring to the preambular paragraph which takes note of the "important meeting of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Mediterranean members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Brioni, Yugoslavia, on 3 and 4 June 1987." The communique adopted by the ministers is highly objectionable to my government because it directly condemns the United States by name on two occasions, and also contains many other statements on North/South issues which the United States does not accept.
>
> We are well aware that the government of Malta, the prime sponsor of this resolution on the Mediterranean and a country with which the United States enjoys close and friendly relations, specifically declined to associate itself with those aspects of the Brioni communique which condemned individual states by name. We are appreciative of Malta's action in this regard. However, the injection of a contentious element into what has heretofore been a non-controversial resolution made the decision to support this resolution a difficult one for the United States. We have, nevertheless, joined consensus on this resolution in the hope that next year's resolution will not contain language we might find objectionable. We will work, of course, with its cosponsors towards that end.

As it has done every 3 years since 1981, Poland took the lead in introducing in the First Committee, on behalf of 19 cosponsors, a resolution entitled, "Implementation of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace." The text recalled the Declaration on this subject, which was adopted by the 33rd General Assembly in 1978, and reaffirmed the validity of its principles. It urged all states to continue efforts toward implementation of the Declaration at the national and international levels. The resolution also recommended that governments and appropriate institutions, "while elaborating their policies, in particular their education programs and school curricula, should keep in mind the principles contained in the Declaration."

The United States disagreed with several elements in this triennial resolution, such as the inference that the UN General Assembly may dictate standards to member state governments and private institutions regarding their educational programs and school curricula, and abstained on the text when it came to a vote. The resolution was adopted by the First Committee on November 25 by a vote of 106 to 0, with 26 (U.S.) abstentions. It was approved by the General Assembly plenary on December 7 by a vote of 128 to 0, with 24 (U.S.) abstentions. (Resolution 42/91.)

The centerpiece of First Committee consideration of the Strengthening of International Security agenda item in 1987 was the fourth SIS resolution (L.89), introduced by the Eastern European Group, entitled, "Comprehensive System of International Peace and Security" (CSIS). A followup to a similarly titled resolution adopted by the 41st General Assembly in 1986, the text contained a large amount of hortatory rhetoric. A key operative paragraph of the resolution, which was tabled by the Eastern countries on November 20 in the First Committee, called upon the Secretary General "to prepare, with the assistance of a group of experts, a study on comprehensive international security and to submit a report to the General Assembly at its 45th session" in 1990.

Many Western and non-aligned states were concerned that this Eastern initiative could undermine or supplant the collective security provisions of the UN Charter and threaten the UN system's viability itself, and were especially troubled by the call for a study by a group of experts, which would have had the effect of institutionalizing CSIS within the United Nations despite the lack of support for the proposal itself. Various delegations engaged in intensive consultations with the sponsors of the CSIS resolution, and as a result the text was extensively amended, in print (L.89/Rev.1) and orally, prior to the Committee vote. As finally adopted by the First Committee on November 25, by a vote of 70 to 12 (U.S.), with 49 abstentions, the resolution retained much of its hortatory language but dropped the provision for preparation of a study by a group of experts. In its place was a request to the Secretary General "to explore the ways and means of organizing an exchange of views on the subject [of comprehensive international security] among the member states and to report to the General Assembly at its 43rd session." Other new elements in the final, revised text included a reference to the "New International Economic Order" (NIEO) and an appeal for "the implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations."

Although the CSIS resolution was adopted by the General Assembly plenary on December 7 by a vote of 76 to 12 (U.S.) with 63 abstentions, fewer than half of the UN members cast their votes in support of it. When compared with the sizeable majority by which the CSIS resolution had been adopted by the 41st General Assembly plenary the previous year (102 to 2 (U.S.), with 46 abstentions), the 1987 vote represented a substantial setback for this Eastern initiative. (Resolution 42/93.)

Despite the extensive revisions to the text, the United States continued to object to the overall thrust of the CSIS resolution, as well as to several of its specific formulations, such as the reference to NIEO and the call for implementation of UN resolutions, many of which are controversial and on which the United States cast negative votes. Prior to casting its negative vote in the First Committee on November 25, the U.S. Representative, Robert

Immerman, explained the U.S. position on this initiative:

> While acknowledging the importance of the Charter, the draft resolution still is basically a vague initiative full of sweeping generalizations which could ultimately distort the very foundation of the Charter. The sponsors of this initiative have begun to pursue the establishment of a new "system" in several United Nations bodies, but have carefully refrained from defining it.
>
> The United States Delegation believes that this organization and its existing associated bodies already constitute a worldwide system fully capable of maintaining international peace and security. There is no need, therefore, to create duplicative mechanisms. What is need is for member states to comply fully— even comprehensively, to coin a phrase—with the political commitments which they undertook when they subscribed to the Charter.
>
> The United States delegation will oppose draft resolution L.89/Rev.1 because the full implementation of the concept of "comprehensive" security would inevitably result in a major restructuring of the United Nations system along lines which would be duplicative, ideological, and financially burdensome.

## HOST COUNTRY RELATIONS

The General Assembly established the Committee on Relations with the Host Country* in 1971 to replace the informal Joint Committee on Host Country Relations. The Committee deals with the security of UN missions and safety of personnel, diplomatic privileges and immunities, tax problems, financial indebtedness of UN missions and their personnel, visa matters, and other issues relating to the implementation of the Headquarters Agreement between the United Nations and the United States.**

The Committee met six times during 1987: March 6, April 30, July 15, October 14, November 18, and November 20.

On December 17 the General Assembly adopted (without a vote) resolution 42/210, which approved the report of the Committee on Relations with the Host Country. The resolution endorsed the recommendations of the Committee contained in its report, strongly condemned criminal acts violating the security of missions accredited to the United Nations and the safety of their personnel, and urged the host country (United States) to take all necessary measures to prevent such acts. With respect to the request andaction by the host country to reduce the size of certain missions, the resolution renewed its request that the host country and the member states that raised the issues to follow the path of consultations with a view to reaching solutions to this matter.

On March 6, April 30, July 15, and October 14, the Committee continued consideration of the question of security of missions and the safety of their personnel. Specific examples were raised for examination by the Soviet Union and Bulgaria. The U.S. Representative emphasized that the United States takes such incidents seriously and that the U.S. Mission maintained close liaison with the law enforcement authorities, in particular the New York City Police Department, in order to secure the safety of UN Missions to the United Nations. He further emphasized, however, the need for prompt and accurate reporting of incidents and reminded the Committee that the freedoms assured by the U.S. Constitution make it impossible to provide absolute insulation from all forms of demonstrations.

---

* The Committee's membership for 1987 was as follows: Bulgaria, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Cyprus, France, Honduras, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Mali, Senegal, Spain, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, and United States.

** Agreement between the United Nations and the United States of America regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations. (Resolution 169 (II), October 31, 1947.)

On March 6, July 15, and October 24, the Committee gave further consideration to the acceleration of immigration and customs procedures. The Representative of the United States informed the Committee of revised procedures with regard to holders of A and G visas which would facilitate transition through customs and immigration formalities. In response to questions regarding particular difficulties, he noted that the U.S. Mission at the United Nations would provide assistance to the extent possible in these matters. In response to complaints regarding up to 2 weeks delay in the issuance of visas for PLO observers, he agreed that visas should be issued as promptly as possible but noted that a period of 10 to 15 working days for the issuance of a visa was not excessive.

On March 6, April 30, and July 15, the Committee considered problems related to exemption of missions and their personnel from taxation. The Representative of the United States informed the Committee of the arrangement with the Con Edison Company under which UN Missions and entitled personnel would be contacted regarding reinstatement of sales tax deduction privileges.

On April 30 and October 14, the Committee considered the matter of indebtedness of UN Missions and their personnel. The Chairman of the Committee said that the problem of nonpayment of debt marred the name of the entire diplomatic community.

The U.S. Representative strongly appealed for cooperation in the prompt settlement of lawful debts, currently exceeding $2 million. He stated that it was not the U.S. Missions' intention to act as bill collector for the community.

On November 18 the Mission of Singapore brought to the Committee's attention the problem of heads of delegations being hindered in their access to the United Nations and to their residential accommodations by the security arrangements provided heads of state or foreign ministers who are participating in the General Assembly. The U.S. Representative, Ambassador Montgomery, expressed his concern that such incidents had occurred. He reminded the Committee that tight security precautions were often essential for certain senior government officials, but stated that the host country was taking steps to ensure better coordination and communication in the future.

On March 6, April 30, July 15, and October 30, the Committee considered strong appeals by the Missions of the U.S.S.R. and Ukrainian S.S.R. that there be consultations over a U.S. demand that they reduce the size of the staffs of their missions as they said was required by resolution 41/82 adopted December 3, 1986. On April 30, the U.S. Representative stated that the United States took its host government responsibilities very seriously and wished to assure that the reductions took place in a cooperative manner and with a minimum of disruption. He stated further, however that his government would not negotiate concerning the level of reductions, that the United States was determined to protect its national security, and that the decision on this matter had been taken after careful consideration.

On October 14 the observer of the PLO drew to the attention of the Committee the amendment pending before the U.S. Congress which would render it unlawful for the PLO to establish and maintain office premises or other facilities in New York. Several representatives and the UN Legal Council opined that the action contemplated by this prospective legislation would be inconsistant with the host county's obligations under the Headquarters Agreement. The U.S. Representative stated that the Executive Branch of the U.S. Government shared that point of view but that it would be premature for the Committee to consider this bill which had not proceeded to the final stages of the legislative process. The progress of this legislation would be closely monitored and the Committee kept informed.

## PROTECTION OF PERSONS UNDER DETENTION OR IMPRISONMENT

Among the draft instruments pending before the General Assembly, the United States has accorded priority to the "Draft Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons Under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment." This draft text was prepared by the UN Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities and was forwarded to the General Assembly via the Commission on Human Rights and the Economic and Social Council. The United States strongly supports this effort as a potentially significant contribution to enhancing the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Prior to the 35th session of the General Assembly, the United States submitted detailed comments on the Draft Principles, in response to a request from the Secretary General.

The Sixth Committee formed working groups during the 36th, 37th, and 38th sessions, under the Chairmanship of Mr. Luigi Ferrari Bravo of Italy, and during the 39th, 40th, 41st, and 42nd sessions, under the Chairmanship of Mr. Tullio Treves of Italy. Despite the best efforts of the Chairmen and the working group members, progress has been somewhat slow due to the complexity of the issues and the resistance of some states to progress in this field. At the 36th session, Principles 7 and 8 were adopted; at the 37th session, Principles 9 through 13; at the 38th session, Principles 14 through 18; and at the 39th session, Principles 19 through 21(1). At the 40th session, Principles 29 through 35 were provisionally adopted. At the 41st session, the Working Group adopted paragraph 2 of Principle 22, Principles 23 to 28, and definitions of "arrest," detention," and "imprisonment." It also reworded Principle 13, which had been provisionally adopted at the 37th session. At the 42nd session, the working group considered, but did not reach agreement upon, a Dutch proposal to broaden considerably the scope of the draft body of principles.

In decision 42/426 (adopted without a vote), the General Assembly decided on December 7 that an open-ended working group again be established in the Sixth Committee at the 43rd session, with a view to expediting the completion of the Draft Principles. The General Assembly also requested the Secretary General to circulate the report of the 1987 working group.

## DEVELOPMENT OF PRINCIPLES CONCERNING INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC RELATIONS

The Sixth Committee of the 42nd General Assembly considered the item "Progressive development of the principles and norms of international law relating to the new international economic order: Report of the Secretary-General" (NIEO) at three meetings on November 12, 16, and 25.

On November 25 the Philippines, on behalf of 17 cosponsors, introduced a draft resolution recommending that the task of completing the elaboration of the process of codification and progressive development of the principles and norms of international law relating to the new international economic order should be undertaken in an appropriate forum, within the framework of the Sixth Committee of the United Nations General Assembly.

This resolution was approved by the Committee by a vote of 102 to 0, with 23 (U.S.) abstentions. The United States, in an explanation of its vote, stated that in its view the concept of a NIEO was in such a preliminary stage of evolution that the consideration of the progressive development of international legal principles concerning it was entirely premature. The resolution was adopted by the General Assembly (Resolution 42/149) on December 7 by a vote of 131 to 0, with 24 (U.S.) abstentions.

## Part 5

# Budget, Administration, and Institutional Management

## INTRODUCTION

U.S. objectives for 1987 in the areas of UN budget, administration, and institutional management once again centered on the reform effort. In the United Nations itself, the United States sought to accelerate implementation of the budgetary and administrative reforms in resolution 41/213, which was adopted by the General Assembly at the end of its session in 1986. As explained below, significant progress was achieved in implementing the administrative reforms, but the effort to accelerate implementation of the consensus based budgetary decision-making reforms was not successful. In the major specialized agencies, the United States, with the support of other major donors in the Geneva Group, sought to have each of them adapt the budgetary process reforms of resolution 41/213 to their own situations. Success was achieved in the WHO, ILO, UNIDO, WMO, and ICAO. The FAO was the only specialized agency in which the United States tried, without success, to achieve an appropriate adaptation of the consensus based budgetary decision-making reforms.

The influence of Congressional views and actions continued to be of paramount importance in regard to U.S. efforts for reform in the UN system. The Gramm-Rudman-Hollings legislation (the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, P.L. 99-177), although not directed specifically at the United Nations and its specialized agencies, continued to set the overall budgetary context against which consideration was given to appropriations requested for U.S.-assessed contributions to international organizations. Reflecting in large measure the difficulties of the Administration and the Congress in agreeing upon means to remain within the limits established by this legislation, final appropriations for FY 1988, including for assessed contributions to international organizations, were not determined until late December. Furthermore, the appropriation ultimately agreed upon for U.S. assessed contributions amounted to only $480 million, which was $104 million below actual net requirements at the time. The lateness of the final appropriation and the well-known prospect for a considerable shortfall in the amount to be appropriated had significant impact on U.S. efforts to pursue the reform initiative in the UN system.

Another important aspect of Congressional action relating to U.S. pursuit of the reform initiative in the UN system concerned efforts throughout much of the year by the Administration and the Congress to work out a revision of the Kassebaum-Solomon Amendment (Section 143 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, P.L. 99-93) in order to reflect the progress achieved in adoption of Resolution 41/213. This amendment, as originally enacted, limited U.S.-assessed contributions to 20 percent of the total budgets of the United Nations and its specialized agencies for FY 1987 and beyond until they adopted voting rights on matters of budgetary consequence proportionate to the contributions of member states to the budgets of the organizations. By December a modification of the Kassebaum-Solomon Amendment was enacted in the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal years 1988 and 1989 (sec. 702, P.L. 100-204). In this modification, the Congress found that "the consensus based decision-making procedure established by General Assembly resolution 41/213 is a significant step toward complying with the intent of" the original Kassebaum-Solomon Amendment.

The modified Kassebaum-Solomon Amendment provides that "the President should continue vigorous efforts to secure implementation by the United Nations, and adoption and implementation by its specialized agencies, of decision-making procedures on budgetary matters, which assures that sufficient attention is paid to the views of the United States and other member states who are major financial contributors to such assessed budgets." Due to its late enactment, this modification of the amendment could not have direct impact in 1987, but the prospect of Congressional action on the issue did affect U.S. efforts to pursue the reform initiative in the UN system.

The modified amendment requires that for full payment of U.S. assessed contributions to the United Nations, the President must determine and report to the Congress that:

— the consensus based decision-making procedure established by resolution 41/213 is being implemented and its results respected by the General Assembly;

— progress is being made toward a 50 percent limitation on employees of any single member state seconded to the UN Secretariat; and

— there is implementation of a 15 percent reduction in UN Secretariat staff, and the reduction is being applied equitably among nationals on the staff.

The final 20 percent of the U.S. contribution to the United Nations must be held for 30 days after the President submits his report to the Congress pending a possible joint resolution prohibiting payment of the final portion.

For full payment of U.S.-assessed contributions to each of the specialized agencies, the President must determine and report to the Congress that each agency "has made substantial progress toward the adoption and implementation of decision-making procedures on budgetary matters" that assures sufficient attention to the views of the United States and other major donors. For the specialized agencies full implementation of the President's determination is not subject to Congressional prohibition by means of a joint resolution.

Against this background of Congressional actions related to U.S.-assessed contributions to international organizations, the United States joined with other major contributors in seeking maximum fiscal restraint in the approval by the United Nations and its specialized agencies of program budgets for the 1988-89 biennium. As in previous years, the U.S. goal remained zero real growth and maximum absorption of nondiscretionary cost increases.

The work of the General Assembly's Fifth Committee (Administrative and Budgetary) is related to the work of all other main UN committees. It deals with organization-wide administrative problems, such as conference scheduling, personnel issues, and the coordination of activities among various UN organizations. Before the General Assembly votes on any resolution having financial implications, the Fifth Committee must provide information on how the resolution if adopted will affect the UN budget. In its most important role, the Fifth Committee makes recommendations to the General Assembly on the regular program budget and on assessed peacekeeping budgets.

Several special UN bodies—some consisting of experts serving in their personal capacities and some of an intergovernmental nature—assist in this work. In financial matters, the best known of the expect committees are the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) and the Committee on Contributions. The ACABQ examines the Secretary General's proposals and reports to the General Assembly on the UN budget and UN accounts; on the administrative budgets of the UN specialized agencies; and on other administrative, financial, and budgetary matters referred to it. The Committee on Contributions advises the General Assembly on all questions relating to the apportionment of UN expenses among UN members. Other expert financial bodies are the Board of Auditors, the Investment Committee (which advises on the management of the Pension Fund), and the UN Joint Staff Pension Board.

The International Civil Service Commission (ICSC), composed of experts in the personnel field, makes recommendations to the General Assembly for the regulation and coordination of conditions of service within the United Nations, the specialized agencies, and other international organizations that participate in the UN common system of salaries, allowances, and other benefits. The Committee on Conferences is an intergovernmental, administrative body, which seeks to develop a workable calendar of UN meetings and advises the Assembly on the most efficient use of conference resources and on current and future requirements.

A senior executive committee, and intergovernmental body, and an expert group have responsibilities ranging broadly across the work of the whole UN system of organizations. The Administrative Committee on Coordination (ACC)--composed of the UN Secretary General and the executive heads of the specialized agencies, the IAEA, and other major bodies and programs--meets regularly to supervise the implementation of the agreements between the United Nations and the specialized agencies and to coordinate the activities of the various organizations. The Committee for Program and Coordination (CPC), an intergovernmental body, serves as the main subsidiary organ of both ECOSOC and the General Assembly for planning, programming, and coordination. The Joint Inspection Unit (JIU), a group of experts who serve full time, is empowered to investigate and evaluate any matter bearing on the efficiency of services and the proper use of funds.

Each of these bodies is concerned with some aspect of making the system work better. The highlights of their activities during 1987 are recounted in the sections that follow.

## UN REFORM

On December 21 the General Assembly adopted resolution 42/211 by consensus. The resolution calls for implementation of the set of far-reaching budgetary and administrative reforms adopted in December 1986 under resolution 41/213. Under resolution 42/211, the Secretary General is encouraged to proceed with the approved 41/213 reforms and to inform the General Assembly if departures from those reforms are anticipated. The resolution also emphasizes the need for financial stability if the reforms are to be successful; provides guidelines for the Secretary General regarding specific reforms recommended by the Group of 18 (The Group of High-Level Intergovernmental Experts to Review the Efficiency of the Administrative and Financial Functioning of the United Nations); sets forth specific parameters for the operation of the contingency fund; stipulates that the budget outline is to be submitted by August 15 of each off-budget year; and requests that a progress report on implementation of the resolution 41/213 reforms be submitted to the 43rd General Assembly.

The operative paragraphs of resolution 42/211 call upon the Secretary General to proceed with the implementation of reform while taking into account decisions of intergovernmental bodies and "to seek the approval of the General Assembly for a departure from the approved recommendations." This language stemmed from the concerns of developing countries that the Secretary General, in his restructuring of the Secretariat, was taking excess liberties with the approved recommendations. The resolution also stressed that "it is essential that the present financial uncertainties be dispelled" if successful reform and restructuring are to occur, and calls upon the member states to meet their financial obligations to the United Nations.

Specific guidelines were provided for implementation of a number of Group of 18 reforms. Concerning the recommendation which relates to construction projects (recommendation 5), the resolution invites the Secretary General to proceed on the two approved construction projects in Addis Ababa and Bangkok, respectively, but specifies that no additional appropriations would be provided in the program budget for the 1988-1989 biennium. The effect of this provision is that construction in Addis Ababa would not begin in the 1988-1989 biennium and that in Bangkok, where the project is more advanced, work to be undertaken would be within the resources already appropriated.

Regarding the overall staffing reductions (recommendation 15 of the Group of 18 report), the resolution, while stressing the importance of the cutback plans the Secretary General plans to submit to the General Assembly, reiterates the need to proceed flexibly with the reductions to avoid negative program impact. Regarding activities relating to Namibia (recommendation 19), the Secretary General is invited to consult with the UN Council for Namibia in implementing the recommendation for consolidating the support activities of the UN Council for Namibia and the Office of the UN Commissioner for Namibia. Regarding the organizational structure of the economic and social departments of the UN Secretariat (recommendation 25), the Secretary General is requested to consider the location of the functions related to liaison with nongovernmental organizations in light of the work being done in this area by the Economic and Social Council on the intergovernmental structure in the economic and social fields. The Secretary General is also asked to review his decision on the Office of Secretariat Services for Economic and Social Matters, which differed from the Group of 18 recommendation (recommendation 29).

With regard to the review of the UN's Department of Public Information (recommendation 37), the resolution requests the Secretary General to reflect in his revised estimates the views of member states and the Secretary General's own assurances. This refers to concerns by some developing countries that the regional programming of activities in the Department should not be adversely affected by the reorganization, and that efforts be made to improve the geographical distribution of posts.

An annex to resolution 42/211 sets forth detailed guidelines for the operation of the contingency fund, based on the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions. Paragraph 14 of the resolution calls upon the Secretary General to propose the provisional procedures on the use and operation of the contingency fund to the 43rd session of the General Assembly. At the same session, the Assembly will consider the question of a comprehensive solution to all additional expenditures, including those derived from inflation and currency fluctuations. The resolution also indicates that the contingency fund's procedures will be reviewed no later than the 47th General Assembly.

With regard to budgetary matters, the resolution stipulates that the date of submission of the proposed budget outline shall be August 15 of the off-budget year and it reaffirms the special role of the Committee of Program and Coordination (CPC) in the consensus based budget process adopted under resolution 41/213. The United States was not successful in accelerating the CPC's special budgetary role during the deliberations of the UN's 1988-1989 program budget. The key test for the CPC and the budgetary reforms adopted under resolution 41/213 and reaffirmed under resolution 42/211 will be at the 43rd session of the General Assembly when the 1990-1991 UN program budget will be deliberated.

## CURRENT FINANCIAL CRISIS OF THE UN

In December 1987 the UN Secretary General submitted his report on the current financial crisis of the United Nations to the General Assembly. In his report, the Secretary General indicated his "grave concern" about the financial crisis which the United Nations continues to face, noting that all of the UN's financial reserves remain exhausted. As of November 16, approximately 37 percent of the 1987 budget assessments remained unpaid; cumulative unpaid assessments totaled $456.4 million, of which $342.8 million was attributable to the United States. In early December, the United States paid an additional $90 million toward its 1987 assessment (FY 1988 funds) which, together with the $10 million paid earlier, reduced our cumulative unpaid balance to $252.8 million as of December 31.

The Secretary General indicated that, should the payment patterns of 1988 be similar to those of 1987, cash depletion must be anticipated in August 1988, notwithstanding an extremely tight proposed program budget for the 1988-1989 biennium. He added that ". . . even if all 1988 assessments are paid in full, cash depletion cannot be avoided unless these assessments, or substantial arrears, are also paid early in the year." Pending the full and timely payment of assessments and arrears, the Secretary General requested authority to take the following measures ". . . to enable the Organization to continue in 1988 to meet its responsibilities to Member States and to the staff . . . ," (1) increase the Working Capital Fund to $200 million; (2) issue certificates of indebtedness in the amounts of arrears, and (3) borrow up to $50 million in the open market.

With regard to the program budget performance for 1987, the Secretary General noted that economy measures implemented during the current biennium were expected to reduce expenditures by approximately $113.6 million by the end of 1987, or approximately 7.8 percent of the net revised appropriation (excluding staff assessment) of $1,450.5 million. The largest share of the reductions were attributable to the application of a freeze on recruitment and deferrals of cost-of-living increases, as well as by reductions in overtime staff travel and the use of consultants. By the end of September 1987, the recruitment freeze had resulted in a vacancy rate of 15 percent of the Professional category and 8.4 percent for the General Service and related categories, or an overall vacancy rate of 10.9 percent throughout the Secretariat. The Secretary General noted that reductions were also achieved by curtailing contractual services by more than 22 percent, general operating expenses by almost 10 percent, and supplies, furniture, and equipment by more than 36 percent. Major construction projects and alterations were either not carried out or were deferred by approximately $25 million. While the Secretary General deferred quantifying the impact of the economy measures on programs and services until the program performance report for the 1986-1987 biennium is completed, he stated ". . . it is quite clear that they (the economy measures) have taken a toll on the overall level of program delivery." His cash-flow projections through December 1987 show a negative cash-flow of $46.8 million, with a cash-on-hand balance at the end of December of $34.5 million (compares with cash-on-hand of $81.3 million at the end of December 1986).

With regard to the proposed program budget for the 1988-1989 biennium, the Secretary General indicated that it had been formulated with a view toward achieving the 15 percent reduction of posts in the staffing tables for 1990-1991 in accord with the target level set by the General Assembly under resolution 41/213. To this end, the Secretary General's proposed program budget reflected turnover deduction rates of 12.5 percent for the Professional categories and 7.5 percent for General Service and other categories. Other economy measures included a reduction of some $25.3 million for operating expenses such as travel, consultants, printing and contractural services, *Ad Hoc* expert group meetings, joint activities, furniture and equipment, etc. In its first report on the proposed 1988-1989 program budget, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) recommended that a higher turnover deduction rate be applied which would result in a net reduction of some $26.7 million of the appropriations relating to the staffing table. The ACABQ recommended a reduction of an additional $8.8 million for various operational items (travel, consultants, publications, etc.) and an across-the-board reduction of $10 million in anticipation of realizing an unliquidated obligations balance and unobligated balance from 1984-1985 appropriations.

In concluding his report on the UN's financial crisis, the Secretary General reiterated that the only solution to resolving the crisis is "...the payment by all member states of their assessed contributions in full and on time." He noted that since experience in this regard was disappointing and that the United Nations would be entering 1988 with cash to meet barely 2 weeks of commitments, he was requesting member states to make advance payments on their 1988 assessments in December 1987. He was also urging members to pay their 1988 assessments in January 1988 or as early as possible thereafter. In view of the projected funding shortfalls in 1988, to include cash depletion by August 1988, he again requested that the General Assembly adopt the three financial measures noted earlier, namely, increase the Working Capital Fund to $200 million; authorize borrowing of up to $50 million in the open market; and authorize the issuance of certificates of indebtedness in the amount of arrears.

The ACABQ, in its report on the Secretary General's report on the financial crisis, recommended against increasing the Working Capital Fund at this time and did not believe borrowing in the open market was prudent, since it would involve interest payments which could be substantial. With regard to the issuance of certificates of indebtedness, the ACABQ had no objection, in principle, on the measure ". . . on the understanding that this would be on a one-time voluntary basis and would entail no additional cost to the budget, and that, after appropriate consultations with member states and potential subscribers, the actual total amount and modalities would be with the prior concurrence of the Advisory Committee."

In his December 11 statement on the current financial crisis in the General Assembly's Fifth Committee, the U.S. Representative, Ambassador Vernon A. Walters, stated that ". . . the solution to the crisis, however, lies not in short or medium-term financial devices, but rather in establishing a climate and an atmosphere of confidence in the Organization, which will better encourage member states to pay their shares of the budget promptly and in full." He noted that the current crisis is one manifestation of member states dissatisfaction with the growth and spending patterns of the UN budget; another manifestation was the creation of the Group of 18, whose recommendations on the UN's administrative and financial functions provide a means for correcting the situation which fostered the current crisis. He stated that "...the adoption of the Group's recommendations in resolution 41/213 was the turning point which, in our view, represented the means for rebuilding the confidence in the Organization required to end what all agree is an untenable situation."

With regard to U.S. payments, Ambassador Walters stated ". . . we are committed to paying our United Nations assessments." He noted that the willingness of the Congress to appropriate sufficient funds would be influenced positively by "...indications that the member states take seriously the implementation of the new budget process adopted by consensus last year." In noting that progress in this area had been less than what might have been hoped for due to the inability of the Committee on Program and Coordination (CPC) to fully assume its new mandate, Ambassador Walters urged the Fifth Committee to "complete the tasks begun by the CPC before we adjourn." Accordingly, the U.S. delegation ". . . believes strongly that adoption of a restrained budget for 1988-1989, based on the Secretary General's proposals as modified by the ACABQ's report, and including an allowance that will, on an experimental basis, accommodate the additional expenses that will inevitably arise during the remainder of the biennium, would both move forward the process begun last year and demonstrate to the world that we are serious about reform." "Such actions . . .," he stated, ". . . are the most practical means to ensuring future financial stability for the United Nations." Ambassador Walters noted further that the United States ". . . has gone to great lengths in a time of extreme fiscal constraint to provide sufficient funding to assure that the United Nations would continue to operate during the present period. It should be clear to all that we retain our commitment to the Organization."

With regard to the measures proposed by the Secretary General for providing additional income should the financial crisis persist, Ambassador Walters stated that the United States believed commercial borrowing and the increases of the Working Capital Fund to be inappropriate. However, the United States would not be opposed to authorizing the issuance of certificates of indebtedness, ". . . to be used only in extraordinary circumstances under conditions specified by ACABQ."

In concluding his statement to Fifth Committee, Ambassador Walters summarized the U.S. view of the current financial crisis and its solution by reiterating that ". . . the only way for the Organization to continue to exist over the long run is to foster a level of confidence on the part of its member states that will ensure timely payment of assessments on a regular basis."

On December 21 the General Assembly adopted without a vote resolution 42/212. The resolution affirmed the obligation of all member states to pay all of their assessed contributions in full and in a timely manner. The resolution also concurred with the recommendations of the ACABQ on the UN's current financial crisis, which, with regard to the measures proposed by the Secretary General for increasing income, would authorize the issuance of certificates of indebtedness under the conditions specified by the ACABQ recommendation. The resolution requested that the President of the General Assembly, in consultation with the Secretary General and the chairmen of the regional groups, keep under consideration the possibility of reconvening the 42nd session of the General Assembly in 1988 to address the UN's financial situation. Lastly, the resolution requested the Secretary General to communicate to member states the latest information on the magnitude of the current financial crisis and, taking account the views of the member states, prepare a summary of such views together with an updated report on the financial situation for consideration of the General Assembly.

## UN BUDGET

On December 21 the UN General Assembly adopted resolution 42/226 approving appropriations of $1,769,586,300 for the 1988–1989 UN program budget. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 146 in favor to 1 opposed with 3 (U.S.) abstentions. The 1988–1989 appropriations are $57,782,100 higher than the revised appropriations approved for 1986–1987. Despite staffing cuts and other program reductions, the appropriations increase reflects the decline in the value of the U.S. dollar and higher expected rates of inflation. In real terms, the 1988–1989 program budget is 2.2 percent less than for 1986–1987 based on the UN's calculations of real growth. This is the first time ever that a UN program budget has shown negative real growth as compared to a previous period biennium budget.

The declining value of the dollar, higher rates of inflation and recalculation of salary costs added approximately $137 million to the 1988-1989 budget level on the first reading by the Fifth Committee. Since the original budget estimates were based on December 1986 exchange rates, the dollar's decline of almost 20 percent against such currencies as the Swiss franc and the Austrian shilling in the past year resulted in an increase of nearly $109 million. Projected rates of inflation higher than those in the initial estimates, particularly in New York, accounted for an additional $12 million. An additional $6 million was requested to implement the recommendations by the Pension Board and ICSC, but the Fifth Committee's decision to delay increases in the rate of contributions to the UN Pension Fund and the deferral of the cost-of-living increase for professional staff reduced this amount by $2 million. Savings also resulted from a net reduction of $7 million in the amount originally budgeted for staff assessment.

Budget add-ons for new programs approved for 1988–1989 totaled approximately $2.1 million. The plenary resolution on Afghanistan was the only so-called perennial resolution approved by the 42nd General Assembly, which resulted in an additional appropriation ($104,000). The revised estimates resulting from ECOSOC decisions added $939,800 to the budget, including funds for programs which the United States supports (e.g. annual meeting of The Commission on the Status of Women). An additional appropriation of $169,700 for a subvention to the UN Institute for Disarmament Research was approved. Also approved was an expenditure of $942,000 for the UNCTAD Common Fund.

This amount represented an advance to the Common Fund and was offset by income of $942,000 under Income Section 2.

The Fifth Committee, despite U.S. efforts to the contrary, did not reach agreement on the establishment of a contingency fund for 1988–1989. The Committee did accept a proposal (considered insufficient by the United States) to consider the contingency fund question in 1989 at the 43rd session. The Committee agreed on guidelines for the operation of the contingency fund in 1990-1991, which were subsequently incorporated into an annex of a separate resolution regarding implementation of the General Assembly resolution 41/213 reforms.

The United States abstained on the 1988-1989 program budget because the appropriations level was higher than what we had hoped it would be and, more importantly, because the 1988–1989 budget was not the product of the consensus based decision-making process approved under resolution 41/213. In speaking in the Fifth Committee on December 21, the U.S. Representative, Mr. Michael Michalski, explained his Government's abstention:

> On the budget itself, the overall level is higher than we and others had hoped it would be. We recognize, of course, the impact of current exchange rate problems reflected in this level, but had hoped for more success in absorbing such increases. We also wish to note, with appreciation, the restraint demonstrated by the Secretary General in his initial estimates, and we were greatly reassured by the restraint of member states in considering both these estimates and the recommendations of the Advisory Committee regarding them. For these reasons, we do not oppose the program budget, despite the serious problems posed by its size.

The U.S. Representative continued his explanation by stating

> . . . More important than the budget itself, the United States' abstention reflects concern we have about a significant element mising from the program budget and the process followed in reviewing and approving it. Of course, we recognize that technically the provisions of resolution 41/213 specifying a budget approval process and contingency fund do not come fully into effect until next year. Full and early implementation of these reforms would have helped to rebuild the confidence of all members states in the United Nations and to assure broad-based support for the vital programs and activities of the United Nations around the world. We regret this was not achieved this fall in the Committee for Program and Coordination.

In expressing the U.S. disappointment that the agreement on the 1988-1989 program budget was not reached under the new budget mechanism, the U.S. representative stated ". . . The fact that the CPC was not able to do this means we cannot join in approving the program budget for 1988-1989."

The U.S. Representative emphasized his Government's continued commitment to the budget reform process by stating ". . . We abstain, rather than vote no, as an indication of our continued commitment to working with others in achieving full implementation next year of the budgetary reforms as we begin consideration of the program budget for 1990-1991." Without progress on budget reform next year, he said, ". . . the initial disappointment will be confirmed and member states must draw their own conclusions about the ability of this Organization to manage effectively and efficiently its mandate under the Charter." The U.S. Representative concluded his statement by citing successful reform efforts in major UN specialized agencies who ". . . have followed the example set by the UN's decision in December 1986 to launch reform . . . (consequently) we now look to the United Nations to be in the vanguard for implementing reform. In that way, it can continue to provide a useful model for the future throughout the UN system."

## AUDIT REPORTS

At the 42nd General Assembly, the Fifth Committee considered the 1986 financial reports and audited financial statements for six voluntarily funded UN programs: the UN Development Program (UNDP), the UN Children's

Fund (UNICEF), the UN Relief Works Agency (UNRWA), the UN Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), and the UN Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA). The reports were considered at nine meetings from October 2nd to October 23rd during which most of the discussion in the Fifth Committee focused on the problems of the audit reports of UNDP and UNICEF.

The auditors issued a disclaimer of opinion on the UNICEF financial statements because of a number of material errors in the accounts and the fact that the external auditor was unable, because of time and financial constraints, to undertake extended audit procedures and expand the scope of the audit. On the other hand, UNDP received a qualified audit opinion due to the fact that the UNDP initially accepts the unaudited financial statements of the project executing agencies into its own accounts, subject to the subsequent receipt of the appropriate audit certificate.

Given the serious nature of the problems related to UNICEF and UNDP, the U.S. Representative, Richard C. Nygard, focused on those two reports in his statement before the Fifth Committee on October 2nd. Mr. Nygard pointed out that, as a major contributor to each of these organizations, the U.S. Government was concerned about the audit findings. With specific reference to UNICEF, Mr. Nygard pointed out that:

> The Fifth Committee must address the central issue of the Board's disclaimer on UNICEF's financial statements. The ACABQ has endorsed the Board of Auditors recommendation for an expanded audit of the 1986 UNICEF accounts to remove the disclaimer. The results of the expanded audit, which could be submitted by the ACABQ and the UNICEF Executive Board in April 1988 and to the General Assembly at its 43rd session. My delegation strongly supports this recommendation and believes it should be approved by the General Assembly.

Turning to UNDP, Mr. Nygard noted that both the Administration of UNDP and the Board of Auditors agreed that the question of the scope of the audit of the executing agencies should be addressed by the relevant governing bodies and the Panel of External Auditors. In this way, the UNDP Governing Council and the governing bodies of the executing agencies would be required to decide whether UNDP's external audit process should be extended to include UNDP project funds managed by the executing agencies. Mr. Nygard recommended that this issue be presented to UNDP Governing Council in 1988.

Before closing, Mr. Nygard gave words of praise to the UN High Commissioner for Refugees for ". . . the steps he has taken to address the organization's problems and deficiencies and to achieve improvements in both efficiency and effectiveness." This development was especially encouraging in light of U.S. concerns regarding UNHCR's utilization of resources. (Public Law 99-93, enacted August 16, 1985, called for annual program audits of UNHCR's funds by an independent consultant, as selected by the Executive Committee of UNHCR.)

Finally, Mr. Nygard stressed the importance that should be attached t the external audit function as an essential element for proper management f all the UN organizations and programs.

A strong external audit function, supported by member states, can resu in significant improvements in the management of UN organizations an programs. We urge the administrators to implement fully th recommendations of the Board of Auditors and the ACABQ.

After the Fifth Committee completed discussion of the audited financi statements, the Vice Chairman of the Committee, following informa consultations, introduced a draft resolution on October 22nd. The dra resolution, *inter alia*, accepted the audited financial statements for UND UNRWA, UNITAR, UNHCR, and UNFPA and requested the Board c Auditors to carry out an expanded audit of the financial statements fo UNICEF and to submit its report to the ACABQ, the UNICEF Executive Boar and the 43rd General Assembly in 1988. After minor amendment, the Fift Committee adopted the draft resolution on October 23rd without a vote. Th General Assembly adopted the resolution without a vote on December 11t (Resolution 42/206.)

## FINANCING OF ASSESSED PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS

The 42nd UN General Assembly adopted three resolutions relating to th financing of the UN peacekeeping forces. All were adopted by the Assembl upon the recommendation of the Fifth Committee.

On December 21 the General Assembly adopted resolution 42/224 by vote of 133 (U.S.) in favor with 3 opposed and 10 abstentions. In adopting th resolution, the Assembly decided to retain the current rates of reimbursemen of $950 per person per month for all ranks, plus the allowance for specialists c $280 per person per month for 25 percent of logistics contingents and 1 percent of other contingents. The Assembly also decided that the rates o reimbursement to the governments of troop-contributing states would b reviewed by the Secretary General, in consultation with the troop-contributin states. The Secretary General was requested to report his findings thereon t the General Assembly at least once every 2 years if, in light of inflation currency fluctuations, or other factors, these rates appreciably affect th absorption factor of two or more of the troop-contributing states. In it November 25, 1987 report to the Fifth Committee, the UN Advisor Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) noted the Secretary General's determination that the current rates were not unreasonabl and, therefore, would not warrant adjustment at this stage.

On December 3 the General Assembly adopted resolution 42/70 by recorded vote of 94 (U.S.) in favor, with 3 opposed and 5 abstentions. Th resolution appropriated $17,400,000 gross ($17,100,000 net) for the operation o the UN Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) for the period from June 1, 1987, to November 30, 1987, and $17,664,000 for the operation of UNDOF for the period December 1, 1987 to May 31, 1988, inclusive. The resolution also authorized the Secretary General to enter into commitments for UNDOF at a rate not to exceed $2,944,000 gross ($2,893,000 net) per month for the period from June 1 to November 30, 1988, inclusive, contingent upon the Security Council's authorizing an extension of the UNDOF mandate period.

The General Assembly adopted resolution 42/223 on December 21. By a recorded vote of 133 (U.S.) in favor with 3 opposed and 9 abstentions, the resolution appropriated $77,932,200 gross ($76,627,400 net) for the operation of the UN Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) for the period January 19, 1987, to July 31, 1987. Also appropriated was $67,567,800 gross ($66,436,600 net) for the operation of UNIFIL from August 1, 1987 to January 31, 1988. The resolution authorized the Secretary General to enter into commitments for the operation of UNIFIL at a rate not to exceed $11,765,000 gross ($11,618,000 net) per month for the 12 month period beginning February 1, 1988, should the Security Council decide to extend the force beyond the 6 month period authorized under its resolution 599 (1987). In this context, the Assembly decided that the UNIFIL financial period shall be for a period of 12 months (from February 1 to January 31, inclusive for any year) subject to renewal of the UNIFIL mandate by the Security Council.

As of December 31 the U.S. assessed contributions outstanding to UNDOF totaled $5,891,693 and to UNIFIL $61,631,042. The outstanding balances for the Soviets (includes the U.S.S.R., Byelorussian S.S.R., and Ukrainian S.S.R.) totaled $27,285,687 to UNDOF and $172,299,551 to UNIFIL.

## SCALES OF ASSESSMENT

At its 40th Session (1985), the General Assembly approved the scale of assessments for 1986-1988, but did not provide guidance to the Committee on Contributions regarding the methodology to be used in formulating the scales of assessment for 1989-1991.

The 41st session (1986), adopted a noncontroversial resolution (41/178) which recognized capacity to pay as the fundamental criterion for determining future scales of assessments and requested the Committee on Contributions to continue "its work on the methodology for drawing up an equitable scale of assessments, taking into account the views expressed by member states in the Fifth Committee. . ."

Since there was no consensus in the Fifth Committee on the alternative methodologies presented in 1986, the Committee on Contributions, at its June 1987 meeting, focused on the existing methodology of calculating assessments and possible changes to existing practices that might better reflect the concerns expressed in the Fifth Committee.

The Fifth Committee considered the Report of the Committee on Contributions at 13 sessions between October 2 and December 2, 1987. Speaking in the Fifth Committee, the U.S. Representative, Michael Michalski, stated:

> In past years . . . my delegation has suggested that assessments be determined on a more equitable basis than the current methodology, and has indicated its view that the concept "capacity to pay" should not be the basic determinant of the scale. We continue to hold that belief, because, particularly in the current circumstances, it is important that all countries feel the impact of the UN budget.

Mr. Michalski pointed out that more countries would feel the impact of budgetary decisions if the floor contribution were raised (presently 0.01 percent for 78 member states) for all except the least developed countries.

Although most of discussion focused on the technical issues raised in the Report of the Committee on Contributions, the representative of Tunisia suggested that in addition to raising the floor contribution, the ceiling rate on contributions (which in practice applies only to the United States) should be reduced from 25 percent to 15 percent. The reduction of the U.S. assessment would be absorbed by other member states in proportion to their assessments under the 1986–1988 scale of assessments. Assessments for all member states, except the least developed countries, would be increased.

This controversial suggestion stemmed from the fact that the United States was continuing to accrue significant arrearages to the UN regular budget. Although no action was taken on the Tunisian suggestion, other members did lend support to the idea of reducing the ceiling for the new scale for 1989–1991.

The Vice Chairman of the Fifth Committee introduced a draft resolution on December 1, which called for the Committee on Contributions to recommend to the General Assembly, at its 43rd session, a scale of assessments for the period 1989–1991 to be prepared on the basis of the methodology and criteria used to prepare the current scale. After informal consultations, the draft resolution was adopted by the Fifth Committee, without a vote on December 2. After approval by the Fifth Committee, the resolution was adopted, also without a vote, by the General Assembly on December 11. (Resolution 42/208.)

The following table represents the U.S. share of the assessed budget of the United Nations, the specialized agencies, and the IAEA for the calendar years 1987 and 1988.

| | 1987 Percent | 1988 Percent |
|---|---|---|
| UN | 25.00 | 25.00 |
| FAO | 25.00 | 25.00 |
| ICAO | 25.00 | 25.00 |
| ILO | 25.00 | 25.00 |
| WHO | 25.00 | 25.00 |
| UNIDO | 25.00 | 25.00 |
| WMO | 24.66 | 24.64 |
| ITU | 7.65 | 7.65 |
| IMO | 5.33 | 5.35 |
| UPU | 5.11 | 5.11 |
| WIPO* | 5.36 | 5.36 |
| IAEA | 25.874 | 25.892 |

*Proportion of combined U.S. assessments for the conventions to which the United States pays assessments.

## COMMITTEE FOR PROGRAM AND COORDINATION (CPC)

CPC is the main subsidiary organ of both ECOSOC and the General Assembly for planning, programming, and coordination. In addition, one of the key elements of the 1986 package of major UN administrative and budgetary reforms (Resolution 41/213) accorded CPC the central role in the UN's new consensus-based program budget decision-making process. Thus CPC is now at the center of U.S. efforts to exercise appropriate influence on the size and priorities of the UN program budget.

CPC members are nominated by ECOSOC on the basis of geographical distribution, and elected on a staggered basis by the General Assembly for 3-year terms. At the 42nd UN General Assembly, over U.S. opposition, 152 to 1 (U.S.), with 0 abstentions (Decision 42/450), the Committee was expanded from 21 to 34 member states.*

In 1987 CPC held a split session in order to deal with its greatly increased workload, meeting in New York from April 27 to May 29 and again from September 14 to 30. The major topics considered were: (1) the UN Proposed Program Budget for the 1988-1989 biennium and related questions; (2) the extension of the medium-term plan cycle; (3) program coordination issues;

---

* Membership in 1987 was still 21 as follows: Argentina, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Byelorussian S.S.R., Cameroon, China, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Indonesia, Japan, Netherlands, Peru, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States, Yugoslavia, and Zambia.

(4) review of certain evaluation activities; and (5) cross-organizational program analyses (COPA).

ECOSOC reviewed portions of CPC's report at both its summer session and its resumed session during the General Assembly. It endorsed CPC's conclusions and recommendations in resolutions 1987/83 on July 8, and 1987/194 on October 20. The 42nd General Assembly considered the CPC report under its agenda item on program planning. CPC's recommendations were approved without change and without a vote on December 21. (Resolution 42/215.)

## The Proposed UN Program Budget For 1988-1989

As the first major test of the new UN budget decision-making process, CPC began its role by agreeing at its first session (April 27–May 29) to set a budget level for the 1988-1989 biennium. The new budget process (approved in General Assembly resolution 41/213) calls for CPC to review in off-budget years a budget outline from the Secretary General, including priorities and an overall resource level, for onward recommendation to the General Assembly. This approved budget outline will then serve as guidance for the Secretary General in preparation of the actual program budget to be adopted the following year. CPC also agreed in principle to establish a contingency fund. Although the UNGA, in adopting its blueprint for UN reform, had given CPC a mandate to carry out these tasks, the resolution did not state specifically that they were to be applied to the 1988-1989 cycle. However, in its initial discussions on these items, CPC had decided to consider them at its 1987 session. As a result, the implementation of the new program budget decision-making process was to be accelerated by a year, since the biennium was already half over when resolution 41/213 was adopted.

This course of action meant that CPC would confront a number of problems. Some were merely procedural and caused by lack of precedent; i.e., CPC instructed the Secretariat to present detailed information on the Secretary General's priority allocations, by budget section so the Committee could better evaluate them. It also set appropriate deadlines for submission of the budget outline and action by the General Assembly. However, most of the debate centered on substantive and contentious issues. These included the overall budget level, the size and arrangements for a contingency fund, and the impact of arrearages of some member states on an orderly budget review process.

U.S. objectives focused on the setting by consensus of an overall budget level for the 1988-1989 biennium and establishment of a contingency fund in the budget which would protect the integrity of the agreed overall budget level. Unfortunately, CPC was unable to achieve a consensus for action on these issues. The United States endorsed the Secretary General's proposal for inclusion of a 0.75 percent contingency fund in the 1988-1989 budget as a critical element in establishing an overall level for the budget and as a demonstration that the 41st General Assembly's reforms were being implemented. However, other delegations now insisted that budget reforms specified in Resolution 41/213 were not applicable until consideration of the 1990-1991 program budget and they rejected further implementation of these budget reforms without settlement of U.S. assessment arrearages. Because of this impasse, all attempts by concerned delegations to reach a compromise failed. Eventually, CPC could agree only to the statement that its "discussion would constitute a useful input into the deliberations of the Fifth Committee." The program budget issue then shifted to the Assembly's Fifth Committee for further action.

## Medium-Term Plan (MTP)

The 6-year MTP was to be completely revised in 1988 in preparation for the beginning of a new plan period in 1990. However, the Secretary General proposed a one-time, major change in the schedule for preparing, reviewing, and adopting the MTP. He asked CPC to endorse a 2-year extension of the current plan (which would otherwise have expired at the end of 1989), offering the following reasons for his request.

> — the need to reflect more fully in the next plan, the results of the reform effort as well as some procedural changes and internal reviews mandated by UN General Assembly resolution 41/213;
>
> — a desire to delay creation of a major new policy document in the hope that the UN's current fiscal problems could be resolved in the interim.

CPC endorsed the extension proposal with the provision that the next plan revision should both incorporate recent legislative mandates and reflect the implementation level of the current plan. Also, the Secretariat was requested to prepare a calendar of intergovernmental consultations related to the plan and to improve its format, content, and presentation.

Regarding the newly approved system-wide medium term plan for women, it was CPC's task to review the document's program structure and make any necessary recommendations to ECOSOC. However, one delegation repeatedly attempted to re-introduce topics which had been deleted by the previous meeting of the Committee on the Status of Women. Only after considerable time had been spent in debate, did the Committee finally reject these proposals. The integrity of the medium term plan for women was thus preserved and sent to ECOSOC without amendment.

## Program Performance For 1986-1987

CPC reviewed several UN capital construction projects which had not only become inextricably bound up with the financial difficulties of the organization but also with pressing needs for humanitarian relief in one of the countries concerned. The 39th General Assembly had approved construction of expanded conference facilities for ESCAP in Bangkok and ECA in Addis Ababa. However, these projects were delayed during the 1986-1987 biennium for several reasons, including the UN's growing realization of the need for fiscal austerity. At the same time, some member states were lobbying on behalf of these projects, so the Secretary General presented scaled-down construction plans for facilities which could accommodate regional, but not global, conferences.

This compromise was unacceptable to some delegations who asserted that there was no UN General Assembly mandate to reduce the scale of these projects. The United States and others countered by rejecting even the revised proposals as being too costly, asserting that UN resources would be better used elsewhere, and that the original contruction plans had to some extent, triggered the organization's current financial difficulties. The Addis Ababa project dominated this debate and at its conclusion, CPC could agree only to refer this issue to the General Assembly, along with a summary of its deliberations.

One major item carried over from CPC's 1986 session was a proposed reorganization of the Department of Public Information (DPI). However, after much debate on many aspects of DPI's work and role in the United Nations, the Committee decided to take a cautious approach to reorganization and await further review of this topic by the Committee on Information. The U.S. statement reserved judgement pending submission of revised budget proposals and urged both greater rationalization of DPI's numerous mandates for activities, and the avoidance of polemics while at the same time publicizing the UN's success stories. CPC ultimately decided to defer this item for another year.

The Committee also considered a long-awaited, comprehensive report on system-wide coordination of activities. Although well-received by some delegations, the United States considered the report to be an innocuous collection of generalities and bland assertions, containing few if any examples of problems in this area, or recommendations for action. However, the Committee accepted the report and simply requested the UN system to strive even harder for greater cooperation and coordination in program implementation.

The Committee also reviewed a report from the Secretary General on implementation of the reform package mandated by Assembly resolution 41/213. Committee discussion focused on the possibly negative impact of United Nations reform on the completion of UN programs and the degree to which the Secretary General should continue to carry out these reforms in light of the organization's continuing financial problems. The U.S. statement complimented the Secretary General on progress made thus far and urged a continuing, orderly implementation process, insisting that this was essential for the continued credibility of the United Nations. After extensive debate on the wording of the text, CPC agreed to a qualified general endorsement of the Secretary General's approach and another call to all member states to fulfill their assessment obligations.

## Review of Evaluation Activities

The in-depth evaluation report for 1987 dealt with the role of electronic data-processing and related activities. While acknowledging that the report was well done, Committee members felt that many of the issues and problems discussed could have been more appropriately handled by UN management, rather than placed before a policy-making body of member states. Therefore, CPC limited its recommendations to general ones encouraging more coordination, more efficient use of resources, and continued efforts to apply data processing concepts to the UN's management needs.

CPC also gave rapid consideration to follow-up reports on UNDP-financed technical cooperation activities of UNIDO in the field of manufactures, the work of the Department of Technical Cooperation for Development (DTCD), progress reports on two future evaluation report topics, and a report on recurrent publications. On all of these topics, the Committee recommended a split in the presentation of recommendations in order to indicate those to be implemented by the Secretary General and those requiring the attention of intergovernmental bodies. It also requested that data-gathering devices be further refined, and that preliminary reports should present those findings already established. Except for the United States, very few members were prepared to present detailed comments on any of these reports. As a consequence, the U.S. commentary, for the most part, formed the substance of the Committee's conclusions.

The Committee was generally pleased with the UNIDO evaluation report and endorsed recommendations related to better coordination of activities with UNDP.

On the DTCD report, the Committee requested better criteria for measuring DTCD's performance, and expressed its concern about the continued fragmented arrangements for evaluation within that department.

CPC considered only one Joint Inspection Unit report in 1987. Its subject was technical cooperation between UNDP and the Economic Commission for Africa. Unfortunately, it was poorly received by member states, with numerous criticisms of both the structure and content. Even the United States had a number of reservations regarding the conclusions and recommendations. After much criticism, CPC agreed merely to take note of the report.

## Cross Organizational Program Analyses (COPA)

COPAs are a mechanism for assisting ECOSOC in the implementation of its Charter responsibilities to coordinate the work of the United Nations and the specialized agencies. The 1987 COPA dealt with the utilization of science and technology for development. Many delegations had considerable interest in this subject, and there were numerous expressions of support and regrets over a perceived lack of progress on implementation. This was considered especially regrettable because 8 years had passed since the adoption of the Vienna Program of Action on this subject and creation of the Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development. CPC made several recommendations which endorsed a vigorous role for the Intergovernmental Committee in directing work in this area and increasing efforts to coordinate the related activities of other UN system bodies. CPC also strongly endorsed the preparation of programmable goals and targets by the Intergovernmental Committee.

At the request of ECOSOC, CPC chose the advancement of women as its 1989 COPA topic. The Committee explicitly emphasized that the system-wide medium term plan on women and development should be incorporated into the analysis, particularly with information related to monitoring progress on the plan's objectives.

The preliminary COPA on the environment (to be reviewed in 1988) and the Secretary General's follow-up report to the 1984 COPA on human settlements received only cursory attention. The Committee agreed with the methodology to be employed in producing the environment COPA, and emphasized the importance of the system-wide medium term plan on the environment. Regarding the other COPA, the Committee asked for more information on implementation of its recommendations by the Commission on Human Settlements.

## JOINT INSPECTION UNIT (JIU)

The JIU consists of 11 inspectors chosen for their background and knowledge,* who are authorized to investigate matters pertaining to efficient and effective operations in the UN system. The Unit focuses on improving the management of UN programs and agencies and encouraging greater coordination at all levels. The JIU statute is currently adhered to by 16 agencies in the UN system.

In 1987 the JIU published six reports and two notes on such topics as problems and costs of document storage; the variety and status of autonomous research institutes; creation of an internal evaluation procedure in the IMO; and various aspects of technical cooperation activities, particularly those involving the regional commissions. Some of these reports dealt with the work carried out by individual organizations, while others were cross-organizational studies of topics with system-wide relevance.

---

* Inspectors are appointed by the General Assembly to serve in a personal capacity for 5-year terms. Richard V. Hennes of the United States was an Inspector during 1987.

Technical cooperation themes dominated the JIU's work in 1987, accounting for one-half of the Unit's publications. For a number of years, some member states have been urging this particular topical preference, and recent UN General Assembly resolutions on the JIU have also referred to the desirability of increased attention to technical cooperation activities. The United States has not opposed this trend. Several of these reports dealt with technical cooperation as an aspect of the work of the regional commissions, and the United States believes that such surveys can contribute significantly to improving the effectiveness of the commissions.

Unfortunately, the quality of the technical cooperation-oriented reports varied significantly, and the United States was critical at times of both the methodology and the recommendations made. However, any report on this subject attracts the attention of many other countries with a direct interest in technical cooperation and this in turn focuses more attention on the Unit's work as a whole, something which the United States has actively sought to encourage over the years.

A general survey of UNICEF, published at the end of 1986, evaluated that agency's operations in terms of its mandates, management operations, program monitoring and evaluation system, and working arrangements with its Executive Board. The report was critical of a number of important aspects of UNICEF's management, and debate at UNICEF's Executive Board over the merits of the report's recommendations was lengthy. The United States viewed these discussions with interest because for several years it had been urging UNICEF to institute budgetary and administrative reforms. While acknowledging that some of the JIU's recommendations had already been overtaken by events, the United States nonetheless pressed the UNICEF Secretariat to be responsive to the JIU, whose past reports had had a positive influence on UNICEF's programs and operations. As a result, UNICEF did agree to several of the management-related recommendations and others are still being actively considered.

The IMO was one of the few UN agencies which, because of its small size and the nature of its work, had not in the past been judged to be in need of an internal system for program evaluation. However, as one of a number of steps taken by that organization to increase its effectiveness, the IMO decided to establish such a system, and the JIU responded with a detailed Note (issued instead of a report for briefer topics), which gave the IMO a set of proposals and guidelines on the appropriate methodology to use. The United States and many other member states fully supported this initiative which is currently underway at IMO headquarters.

In 1986 and 1987, the JIU issued successive reports on storage arrangements for records and publications throughout the UN system. This rarely considered management function was becoming expensive and troublesome for at least some UN agencies and the JIU's interest was welcomed with enthusiasm by record managers growing desperate for more space. The heart of the JIU recommendations was purchase of a state-of-the-art optical disc system of storage and retrieval, a system which offered efficient relief for records storage problems in all agencies. The UN General Assembly approved a modified version of the JIU program of action and it is anticipated that this project will get underway in selected agencies sometime in 1988.

While the JIU's work in encouraging and assisting the development of internal evaluation systems has been universally commended and welcomed, its other studies have too often been criticized and its recommendations ignored. The United States, therefore, welcomed the 1985 request by the General Assembly to the JIU to evaluate the results of its own activities and to report thereon in 1987. This request reinforced continuing American efforts to strengthen the JIU's vital role in improving the management and efficiency of UN system organizations.

In its report to the 42nd General Assembly, the JIU suggested several ways in which its work might be made more useful. These ideas included the encouragement of more suggestions from organizations and governing bodies regarding JIU studies; a more collective approach by the Unit's inspectors during the preparation of surveys; increased reliance on Notes (which could be prepared and acted on more expeditiously); and improvements in follow-up reporting to member states by the Secretary General and the heads of other organizations.

The Fifth Committee took cognizance of the JIU's suggestions as well as a number of suggested internal improvements that the United States had been advocating. As finally adopted, the resolution requested the JIU to, *inter alia*, (1) introduce the improvements it had proposed, (2) follow a more collective approach in the selection, conduct, and preparation of its reports, (3) provide more systematic followup reporting on implementation of its recommendations, (4) place greater emphasis on evaluation, and (5) publish its internal working guidelines. In other paragraphs, the Secretary General was requested to ensure that all relevant JIU reports were brought to the attention of appropriate intergovernmental bodies and that all of them were again urged to pay greater attention to JIU reports and recommendations. This resolution was adopted by the General Assembly without a vote on December 21, 1987. (Resolution 42/218)

## COMMITTEE ON CONFERENCES

The Committee on Conferences met twice during 1987. At a special session from March 23 to March 27, the Committee was unable to achieve progress on the major agenda item regarding implementation of UN General

Assembly resolutions 41/177 B and 41/213. The Committee was to consider the possibility of changing its terms of reference and making the Committee on Conferences a permanent intergovernmental body. The Committee was also to consider the feasibility of becoming a subsidiary organ of the UN's Economic and Social Council. The major issue of controversy centered on the Group of 18 recommendation, as reflected in resolution 41/213, which entrusts the Committee on Conferences with establishing a calendar of conferences within an overall level of resources. This was considered to be a fundamental element of a new mandate for the Committee. Several Group of 77 (G-77) members were opposed to the Committee having any role in the budget process and opposed any idea of an overall level of resources being considered as a ceiling on resources. They continually called for deferral of this issue until the August session. In the end, little progress was made on this key issue and even the proposal that the Committee become a permanent body did not enjoy consensus.

The Committee met at its substantive session from August 24 to September 2. It adopted only one draft resolution for submission to the General Assembly, specifically, a request that the Assembly extend the Committee's current mandate with the same membership for a further year from January 1 to December 31, 1988, and that the Committee continue consideration of the outstanding issues for recommendation to the Assembly at its 43rd session. The major point of contention again concerned the implementation of resolutions 41/177 B and 41/213. In particular, the provision entrusting the Committee with establishing the calendar of conferences and meetings within an overall level of resources, which was considered a fundamental element of a new mandate for the Committee, was not addressed in the draft resolution. This occurred despite strong U.S. and Western European and Other Governments (WEOG) objections. As in the March meeting, the G-77 members stalled progress on the new terms of reference issue by maintaining their opposition to the role of the Committee in the budget process and arguing that no decision could be taken until the UN Committee on Program and Coordination had completed its work on the 1988-1989 UN program budget.

The Fifth Committee considered the draft resolution at seven meetings from October 7 through November 12.

In her statement on the draft resolution, the U.S. Representative, Mrs. Susan Shearouse, indicated regret that the Committee was unable to take on the more prominent and influential role mandated to it by the General Assembly. She stated that:

> . . . My delegation was disappointed that the Committee failed to respond to the directives set forth in General Assembly resolutions 41/177 B and 41/213. Resolution 41/177 B recognized the need to strengthen the Committee on Conferences so that it could fully discharge its functions. It requested the committee to consider, as a matter of priority, changing its terms of reference and becoming a permanent body. In resolution 41/213, the General Assembly decided that the recommendations of the Group of 18 should be

> implemented. The first of those recommendations was that the Committee on Conferences be strengthened and given broader responsibilities, and that the Committee be entrusted with establishing the calendar of conferences and meetings within an overall level of resources. The draft resolution contained in the report of the committee, however, only proposes the extension of the committee for one year. My delegation believes that the terms of reference contained in paragraph 74 of the Committee's report respond to concerns of the General Assembly and provide the basis for a strengthened committee.

With regard to resource issues, Mrs. Shearouse stated, ". . . We hope that, as the new budgetary process is implemented, the role of the Committee on Conferences in this process will be better defined. We believe that the Committee must take into account the resources available for conferences if it is to play a more effective role." Mrs. Shearouse noted the concern of the U.S. delegation regarding the committee's lack of decisive action regarding underutilization of conference-servicing resources allocated to UN bodies. "It is imperative that the United Nations organs recognize the need for, and strive for, a more efficient use of conference resources," she said. With regard to control and limitation of documentation, Mrs. Shearouse expressed the U.S. support of the Committee's decision to ". . . study next year the issue of communications from member states circulated as documents of the United Nations, an area which has gone unchecked to date." In closing her statement, Mrs. Shearhouse noted that ". . . the United States attaches great importance to the work of the Committee on Conferences. However, our support for the renewal of its mandate is conditioned on the assurance that the committee will fulfill the responsibilities assigned to it by the General Assembly resolution 41/213."

The Fifth Committee, following informal consultations by the Vice Chairman, amended the draft resolution proposed by the Committee on Conferences. On November 12 the Fifth Committee adopted, without a vote, the amended draft resolutions A, B, and C calling for, *inter alia*, (1) extending the current mandate of the Committee on Conferences for a further year from January 1 to December 31, 1988; (2) requesting the President of the General Assembly to reappoint the current members of the Committee for that further year, without this constituting a precedent; (3) requesting the Committee on Conferences to continue and complete consideration of the outstanding issues with respect to its mandate and status and, taking into account the views expressed by member states at the 42nd session, make specific recommendations thereon to the General Assembly at its 43rd session; (4) approving the draft calendar of conferences and meetings of the United Nations for the 1988–1989 biennium as submitted by the Committee on Conferences; (5) authorizing the Committee to make adjustments to the calendar for 1988–1989 that may become necessary as a result of actions and decisions taken by the General Assembly at its 42nd session; (6) requesting UN organs, in order to make optimum use of conference-servicing resources allocated to them, to indicate with greater precision the actual number of meetings with conference services that they will require in their coming sessions; (7) requesting the Secretary General to examine the possibility that all organizational aspects of conference-servicing in the United Nations as a whole be centrally planned and coordinated, with a view to ensuring optimum efficiency and cost-effectiveness, *inter alia*, through minimizing duplication and overlapping; taking into account the outcome of the deliberations of the Special Commission of the Economic and Social Council and paragraph 4 of the Fifth Committee's resolution, the Secretary General should present his findings and recommendations through the Committee on Conferences to the General Assembly; (8) requests the UN bodies and the Secretary General to ensure respect for equal treatment of the official languages of the United Nations; (9) in affirming that the allocation of resources to conference services should be sufficient to meet the Organization's requirements, requests the Secretary General to take necessary measures to ensure the provision of conference services to the UN with adequate personnel with due respect for equal treatment of all official languages of the United Nations; and (10) requests the Secretary General to take necessary steps to implement the present resolution and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its 43rd session.

On December 11 the General Assembly adopted resolution 42/207 A, B, and C without a vote.

## INTERNATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION (ICSC)

The International Civil Service Commission (ICSC), a 15-member body of recognized experts,* is responsible for making recommendations on salaries, allowances, and other benefits and conditions of service for employees of the United Nations and specialized agencies that are participants in the Common System of salaries and allowances. The Commission was in session twice during 1987. It met for 3 weeks in New York in March and again for 3 weeks in July. The Fifth Committee considered the ICSC's 13th annual report at 7 meetings between 10 November and 17 December. Informal consultations preceded the introduction of the draft resolution to the full Fifth Committee.

At its two sessions, the Commissioners discussed and debated a full agenda of issues, the most significant being (1) the methodology for comparing UN compensation with the comparator government, the United States; (2) conditions of service for employees in field locations; and (3) the pay problems caused by currency swings. The Fifth Committee continued the debate on these issues and determined that the current methodology for comparing UN compensation with that of the United States should remain unchanged for the time being.

The Fifth Committee concurred with the ICSC that conditions of service for employees in field locations had to be improved. Enhancements were approved to existing provisions rather than introducing new measures. The allowance for posts deemed to have extremely difficult living conditions was increased; the allowance for employees required to relocate was increased; and an adjustment was made to the cost-of-living adjustment at certain nonheadquarters posts.

---

* Claudia Cooley of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management was a member in 1987.

Member States continue to be frustrated with the current compensation system because it is so complex and does not appear to meet fully the needs of either the employers or the employees. A worldwide compensation system, by its very nature, will not be simple because it must address not only the normal objectives of a pay system, but must take into account differences in currency, cost-of-living movements at well over 100 different locations, and cultural differences—and therefore different expectations—in the employers and employees.

Members of the Fifth Committee, reflecting the overall sense of frustration, decided that the time had come to consider a complete overhaul of the system. The ICSC has been instructed to begin a "comprehensive review" of the conditions of service for the staff. The review is to be wide-ranging and may result in a totally different system of compensation. The United States supports this effort which is scheduled to be completed within 2 years.

On December 21 the General Assembly adopted, without a vote, resolution 42/221 on the Report of the International Civil Service Commission.

## PERSONNEL QUESTIONS

Various personnel questions were considered at 16 meetings of the Fifth Committee between October 26 and December 19. Five resolutions were ultimately adopted, all without vote. The resolutions in 1987 covered the following topics: (1) composition of the Secretariat; (2) staff-management relations; (3) respect for the privileges and immunities of international civil servants; and (4) improvement of the status of women in the UN Secretariat.

### Composition of the Secretariat

The United Nations fixes "desirable ranges" for the hiring of professional employees from each member country as a mechanism for implementing the UN Charter provision calling for recruitment of Secretariat staff "on as wide a geographical basis as possible" (article 101, paragraph 3). The formula takes account of each country's level of financial contributions and the size of its population, while allowing a certain number of positions to each member state simply on the basis of its membership in the organization. Not all posts are subject to this system; for example, those requiring special language skills (translators and interpreters) are professional posts, but outside the desirable range purview. The United States, as largest financial contributor, has always had the highest desirable range.

Over the years, there has been a steady trend toward giving less weight to financial contributions and more to membership and/or population in the development of the ranges. The last time the formula was given a major revision was in 1980, when a 6-year compromise agreement (Resolution 35/210) allowed the major contributors to the United Nations to protect their allocations of then-existing positions, but decided to distribute a greater proportion of any new positions on the basis of membership.

In the subsequent years, however, instead of growing, as had been anticipated in 1980, the job base declined. The conversion of UNIDO to an independent specialized agency reduced the base from 3350 to 3000, and the administrative and financial reform resolution of 1986 (Resolution 41/213) called for a 15 percent overall reduction in the size of the staff.

After lengthy negotiations, the Fifth Committee recommended a new formula for determining desirable ranges that specifies (1) a base of 2700 posts (reflecting an anticipated 10 percent reduction in staff in the 1988-1989 biennium); (2) 40 percent for the membership factor (with 6.8 posts designated as the midpoint); (3) 5 percent for the population factor, with the posts to be allotted directly to individual countries in proportion to their size (as opposed to the previous system whereby the population reserve was allotted on a regional basis); (4) distribution of the remaining posts in proportion to the scale of assessments; and (5) upper and lower limits of each country's range determined by a 15 percent flexibility from the midpoint, but not less than 4.8 posts up or down, and with an upper limit of not less than 14 posts.

The new range for those member states assessed the minimum 0.01 percent of the budget is thus 2–14 posts; the U.S. range is 327–442. While the new formula is not mathematically neutral, given the strictures in point (5) above, the end result is reasonable, and the changes in range for most countries are minimal. The greatest beneficiaries of the new formula are China and India—the two most populous countries—who gained the potential for 30 and 21 positions, respectively. The new formula will be reviewed in 1990 by the 45th General Assembly.

In other provisions of the resolution the Assembly called for greater staff mobility between Headquarters and field offices and reiterated its earlier calls for a greater rotation among member states of the posts in the upper echelons of the Secretariat. The resolution was adopted without a vote by the Assembly on December 21. (Resolution 42/220 A.)

## Staff-Management Relations

The administration of justice within the UN Secretariat has for several years been under attack from the staff unions, member states, the ACABQ, and the Joint Inspection Unit. The ACABQ put the case succinctly in its report to the 40th General Assembly when it said that the Organization was facing "significant and growing problems in the form of the multiplicity of time-consuming and cumbersome procedures . . ., the growing number of appeals and other grievances which are filed and long delays in the administration justice." Because of both the direct and indirect costs of this situation, ACABQ believed that there was "an urgent need to simplify administrat procedures with a view to achieving a significant reduction in the number cases requiring full-scale review."

The Joint Inspection Unit, in its 1986 report on the subject, propos several far-reaching reforms which the United States found acceptable. Th included establishing an ombudsman (also recommended by the staff un and some member states); replacing the present multi-tiered recommendat structure with a two-level judicial system; imposing penalties on both s who bring frivolous actions and managers who apply the rules imprope and bringing up to date the consolidated standards of conduct for international civil service, which had not been revised since 1965.

The Secretary General was reluctant to undertake the mass restructuring proposed. In a 1987 report to the Fifth Committee, he describ a number of steps taken to improve and streamline the operation of present system. In this connection his report reaffirmed that the reports of Joint Appeals Board continued to be advisory, but said, "It was decided t unanimous reports would, as a matter of practice, be accepted, provided t they did not impinge on major questions of law or principle."

After considering all the reports before it, and in recognition of the eff made by the Secretary General, the General Assembly held the ot recommendations in abeyance and on December 21 requested the Secret General to continue his efforts in this area and to report again in 1988 to 43rd Assembly. (Resolution 42/220 B.)

A closely related issue has been the long-standing one of the feasibility merging the UN Administrative Tribunal with the ILO Administrat Tribunal. The question initially arose in 1978. In following years it beca clear that no one was willing to forego one tribunal in favor of the other, efforts turned to seeking ways to harmonize the statutes and operations of two. Since 1984 the Secretary General has annually submitted a lengthy elaborately detailed report on proposed changes to the statute of the tribunal which might strengthen its operation. Similar reports were submit by the ILO to its membership. Each year the press of other business preven the Fifth Committee from giving the report the careful scrutiny it required, the report was carried forward from Assembly to Assembly without consideration.

In 1987 the Fifth Committee recognized that intersessional study necessary if any progress was to be made, and it therefore requested Secretary General to arrange for consultations among member states, in N York in the first part of 1988, to examine the proposals in the report, "bear in mind the technical, legal, and administrative aspects of the matter." resolution was adopted without a vote on December 21. (Resolution 42/2

It is expected that these consultations, which will utilize legal experts as well as administrative and personnel experts, will facilitate the consideration—and possible conclusion—of the issue at the next General Assembly.

## Other Questions

The resolution on the privileges and immunities of international civil servants is very similar to those adopted in earlier years. In its principal paragraphs it reiterates the Assembly's concern for the safety of international civil servants in all the organizations of the UN system, deplores the growing number of cases in which staff have been placed in jeopardy, and calls on member states to respect the privileges and immunities of the officials concerned. The resolution was adopted without a vote on December 21. (Resolution 42/219.)

While most of the General Assembly's consideration of the status of women took place in the Third Committee, the Fifth Committee recommended a resolution focused sharply on women in the international civil service. In its principal provisions it noted the Secretary General's extension for another 6 months of the Office of the Coordinator for the Improvement of the Status of Women; endorsed the special measures for monitoring the impact on women of the restructuring and retrenchment under way in the Secretariat; requested the Secretary General to continue hiring women, including from the developing countries, for posts subject to geographic distribution, with a view to achieving a total of at least 30 percent by 1990; and reiterated its request to member states to support these hiring efforts of the United Nations and other organizations by nominating more women candidates. The resolution was adopted without a vote on December 21. (Resolution 42/220 C.)

## UN PENSION SYSTEM

The United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund (UNJSPF) was established in 1949 to provide retirement, death, disability, and related benefits for employees of the United Nations and other organizations of the Common System. There are 16 international organizations in the Fund and about 54,300 participants. The Fund has assets of approximately $6 billion.

The Board held its 37th session in August at the ILO headquarters in Geneva. The major items under discussion were the actuarial evaluation of the Fund, the rate of contribution to the Fund, the size and composition of the Board, and the problems associated with the drop of the dollar in relation to other currencies.

The Fifth Committee considered the Board's report at seven meetings from November 4 to December 17. The recommendations of the Board were, by and large, supported by the United States and adopted by the General Assembly:

(1) The rate of contribution for participants and employers was increased from 7.25 percent to 7.5 percent and 14.5 percent to 15.0 percent respectively. The increases will be phased in over a 2-year period with full implementation on July 1, 1989.

(2) The size of the Board was increased from 21 members to 33 members, effective January 1989. The tripartite nature of the Board will be continued, that is, 1/3 of the members represent the participants, 1/3 the executive heads, and 1/3 the governing bodies.

(3) Interim measures were taken to provide a "floor" in order to preclude losses in the initial pension determination caused by the steep decline in the dollar.

Resolution 42/222 was adopted by consensus on December 21.

## EMPLOYMENT OF AMERICANS

The following tables show American employees of the United Nation and selected specialized agencies as of December 31, 1987.

### AMERICANS EMPLOYED BY THE UNITED NATIONS AND ITS SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AS OF 12/31/87

| | Total Employees | Professionals | | U.S. Percen |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Total | U.S. | |
| UN-Secretariat | 13768 | 4991 | 588 | 11.8 |
| UNDP | 4112 | 837 | 112 | 13.4 |
| UNHCR | 1002 | 371 | 30 | 8.1 |
| UNICEF | 3767 | 1330 | 128 | 9.6 |
| UNESCO* | 2899 | 1127 | 65 | 5.8 |
| FAO | 6149 | 2314 | 157 | 6.8 |
| IAEA | 1779 | 695 | 103 | 14.8 |
| ICAO | 823 | 294 | 22 | 7.5 |
| ILO | 1799 | 730 | 60 | 8.2 |
| ITU | 744 | 288 | 18 | 6.2 |
| UNIDO | 1286 | 430 | 44 | 10.2 |
| WHO | 4379 | 1408 | 166 | 11.8 |
| WIPO | 309 | 105 | 4 | 3.8 |

---

*The U.S. withdrew from UNESCO in December 1984.

## AMERICANS EMPLOYED BY THE UNITED NATIONS AND ITS SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AS OF 12/31/87

| | Other Staff | | U.S. |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | U.S. | Percent |
| UN-Secretariat | 8777 | 1043 | 11.8 |
| UNDP | 3275 | 124 | 3.8 |
| UNHCR | 631 | 10 | 1.6 |
| UNICEF | 2437 | 132 | 5.4 |
| UNESCO* | 1772 | 35 | 1.9 |
| FAO | 3835 | 76 | 2.0 |
| IAEA | 1084 | 61 | 5.6 |
| ICAO | 529 | 5 | 0.9 |
| ILO | 1069 | 18 | 1.7 |
| ITU | 456 | 7 | 1.5 |
| UNIDO | 856 | 37 | 4.3 |
| WHO | 2971 | 41 | 1.4 |
| WIPO | 204 | 3 | 1.5 |

---

*The U.S. withdrew from UNESCO in December 1984.

Americans staff positions at all levels in the United Nations and the specialized agencies. In the UN Secretariat, Americans hold a large number of administrative/management positions, some at senior levels, but are less numerous in political, economic, or social areas. In some of the specialized agencies, they hold high-level policy and program direction positions in critical areas of international organization work, such as, disease eradication and prevention, development assistance, refugee and humanitarian relief, and nuclear safety.

However, in terms of numbers of professional staff, the United Nations is under-represented in most international organizations, with the exception of the United Nations.

Equitable distribution or geographic balance of staff is a major personnel policy issue. In order to achieve equity, the UN Secretariat and some of the specialized agencies have designated certain professional posts as subject to geographic distribution. They have developed formulas to establish the desirable range of representation for each member state, based on factors such as the assessed contribution and population.

The United States currently falls below its desirable range in most of the specialized agencies. In fact, the actual numbers of U.S. citizens employed change very little from year to year during the period 1980 through 1987. The following table displays data for the year 1987.

## UN and Specialized Agencies With Geographic Distribution Formulas

GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF AMERICAN PROFESSIONAL STAFF

UN and Specialized Agencies With Geographic Distribution Formulas

| Organization | Percent of U.S. Assessment | Posts Subject to Geographic Distribution | U.S. Range | Americans Employed |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| UN | 25.00 | 2,700 | 327–427 | 414 |
| FAO* | 25.00 | 1,048 | 198–220 | 75 |
| ICAO | 25.00 | 294 | 48 | 22 |
| ILO | 25.00 | 672 | 112–150 | 56 |
| UNIDO | 25.00 | 341 | 49–66 | 36 |
| WHO | 25.00 | 1,430 | 174–237 | 157 |
| WIPO** | 3.91 | 83 | 6–8 | 4 |
| IAEA | 25.00 | 695 | 125–209 | 103 |

UN Specialized Agencies Without Specific Geographic Distribution Formulas

| Organization | Percent of U.S. Assessment | All Professional Posts | Americans in Prof. Posts Number | Americans in Prof. Posts Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| IMO | 5.00 | 88 | 2 | 2.3 |
| ITU | 7.63 | 261 | 17 | 6.5 |
| UPU | 5.11 | 59 | 1 | 1.7 |
| WMO | 25.00 | 104 | 8 | 7.7 |

We attribute this under-representation in the specialized agencies to various factors:

— While many Americans are interested in working abroad, for 3, 5, or even 10 years, only a small percentage of the population is willing to commit to an entire career abroad.

— Americans generally do not have strong language qualifications. Fluency in at least one language other than English is usually required.

---

*FAO states the desirable range as a percentage; it is given here as a number for uniformity of presentation.

**Desirable range is for North America. Canada has one of the positions.

— U.S. labor market forces are a key factor. The UN system, like the U.S. Government, has difficulty competing with United States private industry salaries and career opportunities, particularly at the entry level, in professions such as law, medicine, engineering, and business administration. These professions are represented in many positions in specialized agencies, including WHO, ILO, UNIDO, ITU, and WIPO.

— With most of the specialized agencies headquartered in Europe, geographic distance hampers Americans' efforts to compete. Note that we have adequate representation in New York-based organizations.

— While international organizations have recruitment programs to benefit under-represented countries, including the United States, there is also special emphasis on recruitment of nationals from developing countries, which also tend to be under-represented.

— This past year, U.S. Government recruitment efforts to reduce under-representation have been severely limited. There have been widespread partial or total hiring freezes. Many openings, particularly at senior levels, have been restricted to internal candidates. In addition, our ability to lobby effectively for U.S. candidates has been reduced, because of shortfalls in our assessed contributions.

## Appendix 1

# Address by President Reagan at the 42nd Regular Session of the General Assembly

### *Statement before the 42nd Session of the UN General Assembly on September 21, 1987*

Mr. President, Mr. Secretary General, honored guests, distinguished delegates: Let me first welcome the Secretary General back from his pilgrimage for peace in the Middle East. Hundreds of thousands have already fallen in the bloody conflict between Iran and Iraq. All men and women of good will pray that the carnage can soon be stopped. We pray that the Secretary General proves to be not only a pilgrim but also the architect of a lasting peace between those two nations. Mr. Secretary General, the United States supports you. May God guide you in your labors ahead.

Like the Secretary General, all of us here today are on a kind of pilgrimage. We come from every continent, every race, and most religions of this great hall of hope where, in the name of peace, we practice diplomacy. Now, diplomacy, of course, is a subtle and nuanced craft—so much so that it is said that when one of the most wily diplomats of the 19th century passed away, other diplomats asked, on reports of his death, "What do you suppose the old fox meant by that?"

But true statesmanship requires not merely skill but something greater. Something we call vision—a grasp of the present and of the possibilities of the future. I have come here today to map out for you my own vision of the world's future—one, I believe, that, in its essential elements, is shared by all Americans. And I hope those who see things differently will not mind if I say that we in the United States believe that the place to look first for the shape of the future is not in continental masses and sea lanes, although geography is, obviously, of great importance. Neither is it in national reserves of blood and iron, or on the other hand, of money and industrial capacity—although military and economic strength are also, of course, crucial. We begin with something that is far simpler and yet far more profound—the human heart.

All over the world today, the yearnings of the human heart are redirecting the course of international affairs, putting the lie to the myth of materialism and historical determinism. We have only to open our eyes to see the simple aspirations of ordinary people writ large on the record of our times.

Last year in the Philippines, ordinary people rekindled the spirit of democracy and restored the electoral process. Some said they had performed a miracle, and if so, a similar miracle—a transition to democracy—is taking place in the Republic of Korea. Haiti, too, is making a transition. Some despair when these new, young democracies face conflicts or challenges, but growing pains are normal in democracies. The United States had them—as has every other democracy on Earth.

In Latin America, too, one can hear the voices of freedom echo from the peaks and across the plains. It is the song of ordinary people marching, not in uniforms and not in military file, but, rather, one by one in simple, everyday working clothes— marching to the polls. Ten years ago, only a third of the people of Latin America and the Caribbean lived in democracies or in countries that were turning to democracy. Today over 90 percent do.

But this worldwide movement to democracy is not the only way in which simple, ordinary people are leading us in this room —we who are said to be the makers of history—leading us into the future. Around the world, new businesses, new economic growth, new technologies are emerging from the workshops of ordinary people with extraordinary dreams.

Here in the United States, entrepreneurial energy—reinvigorated when we cut taxes and regulations—has fueled that current economic expansion. According to scholars at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, three-quarters of the more than 13-1/2 million new jobs that we have created since the beginning of our expansion came from businesses with fewer than 100 employees—businesses started by ordinary people who dared to take a chance. And many of our new high technologies were first developed in the garages of fledgling entrepreneurs. Yet America is not the only or perhaps even the best example of the dynamism and dreams that the freeing of markets set free.

In India and China, freer markets for farmers have led to an explosion in production. In Africa, governments are rethinking their policies, and where they are allowing greater economic freedom to farmers, crop production has improved. Meanwhile, in the newly industrialized countries of the Pacific Rim, free markets in services and manufacturing as well as agriculture have led to a soaring of growth and standards of living. The ASEAN nations, Japan, Korea, and Taiwan have created the true economic miracle of the last two decades, and in each of them, much of the magic came from ordinary people who succeeded as entrepreneurs.

In Latin America, this same lesson of free markets, greater opportunit and growth is being studied and acted on. President Sarney of Brazil spol for many others when he said that, "Private initiative is the engine economic development. In Brazil we have learned that every time the state penetration in the economy increases, our liberty decreases." Yes, policies tha release to flight ordinary people's dreams are spreading around the worl From Colombia to Turkey to Indonesia, governments are cutting taxe reviewing their regulations, and opening opportunities for initiative.

There has been much talk in the halls of this building about the "right development." But more and more the evidence is clear that development not itself a right. It is the product of rights—the right to own property; th right to buy and sell freely; the right to contract; the right to be free excessive taxation and regulation, of burdensome government. There hav been studies that have determined that countries with low tax rates hav greater growth than those with high rates.

We are all familiar with the phenomenon of the "undergroun economy." The scholar, Hernando de Soto, and his colleagues have examine the situation of one country—Peru—and described an economy of the poo that bypasses crushing taxation and stifling regulation. This "informatio economy," as the researchers call it, is the principal supplier of many good and services, and often the only ladder for upward mobility. In the capita city, it accounts for almost all public transportation and most street market And the researchers concluded that, thanks to the informal economy, "Th poor can work, travel, and have a roof over their heads." They might hav added that by becoming underground entrepreneurs themselves or b working for them, the poor have become less poor and the nation itself richer

Those who advocate statist solutions to development should take note— the free market is the other path to development and the one true path. It i the people's path. And, unlike many other paths, it leads somewhere. I works.

So this is where I believe we can find the map to the world's future—i the hearts of ordinary people; in their hopes for themselves and their children in their prayers as they lay themselves and their families to rest each night These simple people are the giants of the Earth, the true builders of the worl and shapers of the centuries to come. And if indeed they triumph, as I believe they will, we will at last know a world of peace and freedom, opportunity and hope, and, yes, of democracy—a world in which the spirit of mankind a last conquers the old, familiar enemies of famine, disease, tyranny, and war.

This is my vision—America's vision. I recognize that some governments represented in this Hall have other ideas. Some do not believe in democracy or in political, economic, or religious freedom. Some believe in dictatorship— whether by one man, one party, one class, one race, or one vanguard. To those governments I would only say that the price of oppression is clear.

Your economies will fall farther and farther behind. Your people will become more restless. Isn't it better to listen to the people's hopes now, rather than their curses later?

And yet, despite our differences, there is one common hope that brought us all to make this common pilgrimage—the hope that mankind will one day beat its words into plowshares; the hope of peace.

In no place on Earth today is peace more in need of friends than in the Middle East. Its people's yearning for peace is growing. The United States will continue to be an active partner in the efforts of the parties to come together to settle their differences and build a just and lasting peace.

And this month marks the beginning of the eighth year of the Iran-Iraq War. Two months ago, the Security Council adopted a mandatory resolution demanding cease-fire, withdrawal, and negotiations to end the war. The United States fully supports implementation of Resolution 598, as we support the Secretary General's recent mission. We welcomed Iraq's acceptance of that resolution, and remain disappointed at Iran's unwillingness to accept it.

In that regard, I know that the President of Iran will be addressing you tomorrow. I take this opportunity to call upon him clearly and unequivocally to state whether Iran accepts 598 or not. If the answer is positive, it would be a welcome step and major breakthrough. If it is negative, the Council has no choice but rapidly to adopt enforcement measures.

For 40 years the United States has made clear its vital interest in the security of the Persian Gulf and the countries that border it. The oil reserves there are of strategic importance to the economies of the free world. We are committed to maintaining the free flow of this oil and to prevent the domination of the region by any hostile power.

We do not seek confrontation or trouble with Iran or anyone else. Our objective is now, and has been at every stage, finding a means to end the war with no victor and no vanquished. The increase in our naval presence in the Gulf does not favor one side or the other. It is a response to heightened tensions and followed consultations with our friends in the region. When the tension diminishes, so will our presence.

The United States is gratified by many recent diplomatic developments—the unanimous adoption of Resolution 598, the Arab League's statement at its recent meeting in Tunis, and the Secretary General's visit. Yet problems remain.

The Soviet Union helped in drafting and reaching an agreement on Resolution 598. But outside the Security Council, the Soviets have acted differently. They called for removal of our Navy from the Gulf, where it has been for 40 years. They made the false accusation that somehow the United

States—rather than the war itself—is the source of tension in the Gulf. Suc statements are not helpful. They divert attention from the challenge facing all— a just end to the war.

The United States hopes the Soviets will join the other members of th Security Council in vigorously seeking an end to a conflict that should neve have begun, should have ended long ago, and has become one of the grea tragedies of the postwar era.

Elsewhere in the region, we see the continuing Soviet occupation Afghanistan. After nearly eight years, a million casualties, nearly four millio others driven into exile, and more intense fighting than ever—it's time for th Soviet Union to leave.

The Afghan people must have the right to determine their own futur free of foreign coercion. There is no excuse for prolonging a brutal war o propping up a regime whose days are clearly numbered. That regime offer political proposals that pretend compromise, but really would ensure th perpetuation of the regime's power. Those proposals have failed the onl significant test: They have been rejected by the Afghan people. Every day th resistance grows in strength. It is an indispensable party in the quest for negotiated solution.

The world community must continue to insist on genuine self determination; prompt and full Soviet withdrawal; and the return of th refugees to their homes in safety and honor. The attempt may be made t pressure a few countries to change their vote this year, but this body, I know will vote overwhelmingly, as every year before, for Afghan independence and freedom.

We have noted General Secretary Gorbachev's statement of readiness to withdraw In April, I asked the Soviet Union to set a date this year when this withdrawal would begin. I repeat that request now, in this forum for peace. I pledge that once the Soviet Union shows convincingly that it's ready for a genuine political settlement, the United States is ready to be helpful.

Let me add one final note on this matter. Pakistan, in the face of enormous pressure and intimidation, has given sanctuary to Afghan refugees. We salute the courage of Pakistan and the Pakistani people. They deserve strong support from all of us.

Another regional conflict, we all know, is taking place in Central America—in Nicaragua.

To the Sandinista delegation here today I say: Your people know the true nature of your regime. They have seen their liberties suppressed. They have seen the promises of 1979 go unfulfilled. They have seen their real wages and personal income fall by half—yes, half—since 1979, while your

Party elite live lives of privilege and luxury.

This is why, despite a billion dollars in Soviet-bloc aid last year alone, despite the largest and best equipped army in Central America, you face a popular revolution at home. It is why the democratic resistance is able to operate freely deep in your heartland. But this revolution should come as no surprise to you. It is only the revolution you promised the people, and that you then betrayed.

The goal of United States policy towards Nicaragua is simple. It is the goal of the Nicaraguan people and the freedom fighters as well: It is democracy—real, free, pluralistic, constitutional democracy. Understand this: We will not, and the world community will not, accept phoney "democratization" designed to mask the perpetuation of dictatorship.

In this 200th year of our own Constitution, we know that real democracy depends on the safeguards of an institutional structure that prevents a concentration of power. It is that which makes rights secure. The temporary relaxation of controls—which can later be tightened—is not democratization.

Again, to the Sandinistas, I say: We continue to hope that Nicaragua will become part of the genuine democratic transformation we have seen throughout Central America in this decade. We applaud the principles embodied in the Guatemala agreement, which links the security of the Central American democracies to democratic reform in Nicaragua. Now is the time for you to shut down the military machine that threatens your neighbors and assaults your own people. You must end your stranglehold on internal political activity. You must hold free and fair national elections. The media must be truly free—not censored or intimidated or crippled by indirect measures like the denial of newsprint or threats against journalists or their families. Exiles must be allowed to return to minister, to live, to work, and to organize politically. Then, when persecution of religion has ended, and the jails no longer contain political prisoners, national reconciliation and democracy will be possible.

Unless this happens, "democratization" will be a fraud. And until it happens, we will press for true democracy by supporting those fighting for it.

Freedom in Nicaragua or Angola or Afghanistan or Cambodia or Eastern Europe or South Africa or anyplace else on the globe is not just an internal matter. Some time ago the Czech dissident writer, Vaclav Havel warned the world that, "respect for human rights is the fundamental condition and the sole genuine guarantee of true peace." And Andrei Sakharov in his Nobel Lecture said: "I am convinced that international confidence, mutual understanding, disarmament, and international security are inconceivable without an open society with freedom of information, freedom of conscience, the right to publish, and the right to travel and choose the country in which one wishes to live."

Freedom serves peace. The quest for peace must serve the cause of freedom. Patient diplomacy can contribute to a world in which both can flourish. We are heartened by new prospects for improvement in East-West and particularly U.S.-Soviet relations.

Last week Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze visited Washington for talks with me and with Secretary of State Shultz. We discussed the full range of issues, including my longstanding efforts to achieve, for the first time, deep reductions in U.S. and Soviet nuclear arms. It was six years ago, for example, that I proposed the "zero option" for U.S. and Soviet longer-range, intermediate-range nuclear missiles. I am pleased that we have now agreed in principle to a truly historic treaty that will eliminate an entire class of U.S. and Soviet nuclear weapons. We also agreed to intensify our diplomatic efforts in all areas of mutual interest.

Toward that end, Secretary Shultz and the Foreign Minister will meet again, a month from now, in Moscow, and I will meet again with General Secretary Gorbachev later this fall.

We continue to have our differences and probably always will. But that puts a special responsibility on us to find ways—realistic ways—to bring greater stability to our competition and to show the world a constructive example of the value of communication and of the possibility of peaceful solutions to political problems.

Here let me add that we seek, through our Strategic Defense Initiative, to find a way to keep the peace through relying on defense—not offense—for deterrence and for eventually rendering ballistic missiles obsolete. SDI has greatly enhanced the prospects for real arms reduction. It is a crucial part of our efforts to ensure a safer world and a more stable strategic balance.

We will continue to pursue the goal of arms reduction, particularly the goal that the General Secretary and I agreed upon—a 50-percent reduction in our respective strategic nuclear arms. We will continue to press the Soviets for more constructive conduct in the settling of regional conflicts. We look to the Soviets to honor the Helsinki Accords. We look for greater freedom for the Soviet peoples within their country, more people-to-people exchanges with our country, and Soviet recognition in practice of the right of freedom of movement.

We look forward to a time when things we now regard as sources of friction and even danger can become examples of cooperation between ourselves and the Soviet Union. For instance, I have proposed a collaboration to reduce the barriers between East and West in Berlin, and more broadly in Europe as a whole. Let us work together for a Europe in which force or the threat of force, whether in the form of walls or of guns, is no longer an obstacle to free choice by individuals and whole nations. I have also called for more openness in the flow of information from the Soviet Union about its military forces, policies, and programs so that our negotiations about arms reduction can proceed with greater confidence.

We hear much about changes in the Soviet Union. We are intensely interested in these changes. We hear the word, "glasnost," which is translated as "openness." In English, "openness" is a broad term. It means the free, unfettered flow of information, ideas, and people. It means political and intellectual liberty in all its dimensions. We hope, for the sake of the peoples of the U.S.S.R., that such changes will come. And, we hope, for the sake of peace, that it will include a foreign policy that respects the freedom and independence of other peoples.

No place should be better suited for discussions of peace than this hall. The first Secretary General, Trygve Lie, said of the United Nations: "With the danger of fire, and in the absence of an organized fire department, it is only common sense for the neighbors to join in setting up their own fire brigades."

Joining together to drown the flames of war—this, together with a Universal Declaration of Human Rights, was the founding ideal of the United Nations. It is our continuing challenge to ensure that the United Nations lives up to these hopes.

As the Secretary General noted some time ago, the risk of anarchy in the world has increased because the fundamental rules of the UN Charter have been violated. The General Assembly has repeatedly acknowledged this with regard to the occupation of Afghanistan. The Charter has a concrete practical meaning today because it touches on all the dimensions of human aspiration that I mention earlier—the yearning for democracy and freedom, for global peace, and for prosperity.

This is why we must protect the Universal Declaration of Human Rights from being debased as it was through the infamous "Zionism is Racism" resolution. We cannot permit attempts to control the media and promote censorship under the ruse of a so-called, "New World Information Order." We must work against efforts to introduce contentious and non-relevant issues into work of the specialized and technical agencies where we seek progress on urgent problems from terrorism to drug trafficking to nuclear proliferation, which threaten us all. Such efforts corrupt the Charter and weaken this Organization.

There have been important administrative and budget reforms. They have helped. The United States is committed to restoring its contribution as reforms progress. But there is still much to do. The United Nations was built on great dreams and great ideals. Sometimes it has strayed. It is time for it to come home.

It was Dag Hammarskjold who said, "The end of all political efforts must be the well-being of the individual in a life of safety and freedom"

Should this not be our credo in the years ahead?

I have spoken today of a vision and of the obstacles to its realization. More than a century ago a young Frenchman, Alexis de Tocqueville, visited America. After that visit he predicted that the two great powers of the future would be, on one hand, the United States, which would be built, as he said, "by the plowshare, " and, on the other, Russia, which would go forward, again, as he said, "by the sword." Yet need it be so? Cannot swords be turned to plowshares? Can we and all nations not live in peace?

In our obsession with antagonisms of the moment, we often forget how much unites all the members of humanity. Perhaps we need some outside, universal threat to make us recognize this common bond. I occasionally think how quickly our differences worldwide would vanish if we were facing an alien threat from outside this world. And yet, I ask you, is not an alien force already among us? What could be more alien to the universal aspirations of our peoples than war and the threat of war?

Two centuries ago, in a hall much smaller than this one, in Philadelphia, Americans met to draft a Constitution. In the course of their debates, one of them said that the new government, if it was to rise high, must be built on the broadest base, the will and consent of the people. And so it was. And so it has been.

My message today is that the dreams of ordinary people reach to astonishing heights. If we diplomatic pilgrims are to achieve equal altitudes, we must build all we do on the full breadth of humanity's will and consent and the full expanse of the human heart.

## Appendix 2

# Principal Organs of the United Nations

### General Assembly

The General Assembly is composed of all 159 members. They are:

| Member | Date of Admission |
|---|---|
| Afghanistan | Nov. 19, 1946 |
| Albania | Dec. 14, 1955 |
| Algeria | Oct. 8, 1962 |
| Angola | Dec. 1, 1976 |
| Antigua and Barbuda | Nov. 11, 1981 |
| Argentina | Oct.. 24, 1945 |
| Australia | Nov. 1, 1945 |
| Austria | Dec. 14, 1955 |
| Bahamas | Sept. 18, 1973 |
| Bahrain | Sept. 21, 1971 |
| Bangladesh | Sept. 17, 1974 |
| Barbados | Dec. 9, 1966 |
| Belgium | Dec. 27, 1945 |
| Belize | Sept. 25, 1981 |
| Benin | Sept. 20, 1960 |
| Bhutan | Sept. 21, 1971 |
| Bolivia | Nov. 14, 1945 |
| Botswana | Oct. 17, 1966 |
| Brazil | Oct. 24, 1945 |
| Brunei Darussalam | Sept. 21, 1984 |
| Bulgaria | Dec. 14, 1955 |
| Burkina Faso | Sept. 20, 1960 |
| Burma | Apr. 19, 1948 |
| Burundi | Sept. 18, 1962 |
| Byelorussian S.S.R. | Oct. 24, 1945 |
| Cameroon | Sept. 20, 1960 |
| Canada | Nov. 9, 1945 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Cape Verde | Sept. 16, 1975 |
| Central African Republic | Sept. 20, 1960 |
| Chad | Sept. 20, 1960 |
| Chile | Oct. 24, 1945 |
| China* | Oct..24, 1945 |
| Colombia | Nov. 5, 1945 |
| Comoros | Nov. 12, 1975 |
| Congo | Sept. 20, 1960 |
| Costa Rica | Nov. 2, 1945 |
| Cote d'Ivoire (Ivory Coast) | Sept. 20, 1960 |
| Cuba | Oct.. 24, 1945 |
| Cyprus | Sept. 20, 1960 |
| Czechoslovakia | Oct. 24, 1945 |
| Denmark | Oct. 24, 1945 |
| Djibouti | Sept. 20, 1977 |
| Dominica | Dec. 18, 1978 |
| Dominican Republic | Oct. 24, 1945 |
| Ecuador | Dec. 21, 1945 |
| Egypt | Oct. 24, 1945 |
| El Salvador | Oct. 24, 1945 |
| Equatorial Guinea | Nov. 12, 1968 |
| Ethiopia | Nov. 13, 1945 |
| Fiji | Oct. 13, 1970 |
| Finland | Dec. 14, 1955 |
| France | Oct. 24, 1945 |
| Gabon | Sept. 20, 1960 |
| Gambia | Sept. 21, 1965 |
| German Democratic Republic | Sept. 18, 1973 |
| Germany, Federal Republic of | Sept. 18, 1973 |
| Ghana | Mar. 8, 1957 |
| Greece | Oct. 25, 1945 |
| Grenada | Sept. 17, 1974 |
| Guatemala | Nov. 21, 1945 |
| Guinea | Dec. 12, 1958 |
| Guinea-Bissau | Sept. 17, 1974 |
| Guyana | Sept. 20, 1966 |
| Haiti | Oct. 24, 1945 |
| Honduras | Dec. 17, 1945 |
| Hungary | Dec. 14, 1955 |
| Iceland | Nov. 19, 1946 |
| India | Oct. 30, 1945 |
| Indonesia | Sept. 28, 1950 |
| Iran | Oct. 24, 1945 |
| Iraq | Dec. 21, 1945 |

---

*By resolution 2758 (XXVI) of October 25, 1971, the General Assembly decided "to restore all its rights to the People's Republic of China and to recognize the representatives of its Government as the only legitimate representatives of China to the United Nations."

| | |
|---|---|
| Ireland | Dec. 14, 1955 |
| Israel | May 11, 1949 |
| Italy | Dec. 14, 1955 |
| Jamaica | Sept. 18, 1962 |
| Japan | Dec. 18, 1956 |
| Jordan | Dec. 14, 1955 |
| Kampuchea | Dec. 14, 1955 |
| Kenya | Dec. 16, 1963 |
| Kuwait | May 14, 1963 |
| Laos | Dec. 14, 1955 |
| Lebanon | Oct. 24, 1945 |
| Lesotho | Oct. 17, 1966 |
| Liberia | Nov. 2, 1945 |
| Libya | Dec. 14, 1955 |
| Luxembourg | Oct. 24, 1945 |
| Madagascar | Sept. 20, 1960 |
| Malawi | Dec. 1, 1964 |
| Malaysia | Sept. 17, 1957 |
| Maldives | Sept. 21, 1965 |
| Mali | Sept. 28, 1960 |
| Malta | Dec. 1, 1964 |
| Mauritania | Oct.. 27, 1961 |
| Mauritius | Apr. 24, 1968 |
| Mexico | Nov. 7, 1945 |
| Mongolia | Oct. 27, 1961 |
| Morocco | Nov. 12, 1956 |
| Mozambique | Sept. 16, 1975 |
| Nepal | Dec. 14, 1955 |
| Netherlands | Dec. 10, 1945 |
| New Zealand | Oct. 24, 1945 |
| Nicaragua | Oct. 24, 1945 |
| Niger | Sept. 20, 1960 |
| Nigeria | Oct. 7, 1960 |
| Norway | Nov. 27, 1945 |
| Oman | Oct. 7, 1971 |
| Pakistan | Sept. 30, 1947 |
| Panama | Nov. 13, 1945 |
| Papua New Guinea | Oct. 10, 1975 |
| Paraguay | Oct. 24, 1945 |
| Peru | Oct. 31, 1945 |
| Philippines | Oct..24, 1945 |
| Poland | Oct. 24, 1945 |
| Portugal | Dec. 14, 1955 |
| Qatar | Sept. 21, 1971 |
| Romania | Dec. 14, 1955 |
| Rwanda | Sept. 18, 1962 |
| Saint Kitts and Nevis | Sept. 23, 1983 |
| Saint Lucia | Sept. 18, 1979 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Saint Vincent and the Grenadines | Sept. 16, 1980 |
| Samoa | Dec. 15, 1976 |
| Sao Tome and Principe | Sept. 16, 1975 |
| Saudi Arabia | Oct. 24, 1945 |
| Senegal | Sept. 28, 1960 |
| Seychelles | Sept. 21, 1976 |
| Sierra Leone | Sept. 27, 1961 |
| Singapore | Sept. 21, 1965 |
| Solomon Islands | Sept. 19, 1978 |
| Somalia | Sept. 20, 1960 |
| South Africa | Nov. 7, 1945 |
| Spain | Dec. 14, 1955 |
| Sri Lanka | Dec. 14, 1955 |
| Sudan | Nov. 12, 1956 |
| Suriname | Dec. 4, 1975 |
| Swaziland | Sept. 24, 1968 |
| Sweden | Nov. 19, 1946 |
| Syria | Oct. 24, 1945 |
| Tanzania | Dec. 14, 1961 |
| Thailand | Dec. 16, 1946 |
| Togo | Sept. 20, 1960 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | Sept. 18, 1962 |
| Tunisia | Nov. 12, 1956 |
| Turkey | Oct. 24, 1945 |
| Uganda | Oct. 25, 1962 |
| Ukrainian S.S.R. | Oct. 24, 1945 |
| U.S.S.R. | Oct. 24, 1945 |
| United Arab Emirates | Dec. 9, 1971 |
| United Kingdom | Oct. 24, 1945 |
| United States | Oct. 24, 1945 |
| Uruguay | Dec. 18, 1945 |
| Vanuatu | Sept. 15, 1981 |
| Venezuela | Nov. 15, 1945 |
| Vietnam | Sept. 20, 1977 |
| Yemen (Aden) | Dec. 14, 1967 |
| Yemen (Sanaa) | Sept. 30, 1947 |
| Yugoslavia | Oct. 24, 1945 |
| Zaire | Sept. 20, 1960 |
| Zambia | Dec. 1, 1964 |
| Zimbabwe | Aug. 25, 1980 |

The 41st regular session of the General Assembly, which had b suspended December 19, 1986, was resumed September 14, 1987, in orde formally close the session. One agenda item, election of a member of International Court of Justice, was considered at the meeting. It was deci to include in the draft agenda of the 42nd session those agenda items that not been considered at the 41st General Assembly. Those items were: review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of

United Nations; (2) question of Cyprus; (3) consequences of the prolongation of the armed conflict between Iran and Iraq; (4) review of the implementation of the recommendations and decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its tenth special session; (5) current financial crisis of the United Nations; and (6) judgment of the International Court of Justice of 27 June 1986 concerning military and paramilitary activities in and against Nicaragua. The agenda item regarding the implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations was deferred to the 43rd session of the General Assembly.

The 42nd regular session of the General Assembly convened September 15, 1987, and was suspended December 21, 1987.

The Assembly elected Peter Florin (German Democratic Republic) as President and the Chairmen of the Delegations of Botswana, Cameroon, China, Comoros, France, Jordan, Mauritania, Mongolia, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Portugal, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, and the United States as the 21 Vice Presidents.

The Chairmen of the seven main committees, on which each member may be represented, were:

First Committee (Political and Security) - Bagbeni Adeito Nzengeya (Zaire)
Special Political Committee - Hamad Abdelaziz Al-Kawari (Qatar)
Second Committee (Economic and Financial) - Guennadi I. Oudovenko (Ukrainian S.S.R.)
Third Committee (Social, Humanitarian, and Cultural) - Jorge E. Ritter (Panama)
Fourth Committee (Decolonization) - Constantine Moushoutas (Cyprus)
Fifth Committee (Administrative and Budgetary) - Henrik Amneus (Sweden)
Sixth Committee (Legal) - Rajab A. Azzorouk (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

The General Committee (steering committee) is composed of the President, the 21 Vice Presidents, and Chairmen of the Seven Committees.

## SECURITY COUNCIL

The Security Council is composed of 5 members designated in the Charter as permanent and 10 members elected by the General Assembly for 2-year terms ending December 31 of the year given in the heading:

Permanent Members: China, France, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, United States.
1987: Bulgaria, Congo, Ghana, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela
1988: Argentina, Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Japan, Zambia.

On October 15, 1987, the Assembly elected Algeria, Brazil, Nepal, Senegal, and Yugoslavia as members of the Security Council for a 2-year term of office beginning January 1, 1988.

## TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

The Trusteeship Council is composed of the United States (as administrator of a territory), and the other four permanent members of the Security Council (China, France, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom).

The Trusteeship Council held its 54th meeting May 11-29 and a resumed session Dec. 14-16, both in New York. The 18th special session was held on August 13 at UN Headquarters to consider the dispatch of a mission to observe a plebiscite in Palau on the Compact of Free Association.

## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

ECOSOC is composed of 54 members elected by the General Assembly for 3-year terms ending December 31 of the year given in the heading:

1987: Bangladesh, Brazil, Colombia, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Guinea, Haiti, Iceland, India, Japan, Morocco, Nigeria, Romania, Senegal, Spain, Turkey, Venezuela, Zimbabwe.

1988: Australia, Belgium, Byelorussian S.S.R., Djibouti, Egypt, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Mozambique, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Sierra Leone, Syrian Arab Republic, United States.

1989: Belize, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Denmark, Iran, Norway, Oman, Poland, Rwanda, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, Uruguay, Zaire.

On October 21 and November 3, 1987, the General Assembly elected Colombia, Cuba, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, India, Ireland, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Trinidad and Tobogo, Venezuela, and Yugoslavia for terms beginning on January 1, 1988.

ECOSOC held its organizational session for 1987 (February 3-6) and its first regular session (May 4-29) in New York.

The second regular session of 1987 was held in Geneva (June 23- July 9).

# INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

The International Court of Justice consists of 15 members elected by the General Assembly and Security Council for 9-year terms ending February 5 of the year given in parenthesis. The Judges, listed in their order of precedence, are:

Nagendra Singh of India (1991), President
Keba Mbaye of Senegal (1991), Vice President
Manfred Lachs of Poland (1994)
Jose Maria Ruda of Argentina (1991)
Taslim Olawale Elias of Nigeria (1994)
Shigeru Oda of Japan (1994)
Roberto Ago of Italy (1997)
Stephen M. Schwebel of the United States (1997)
Robert Y. Jennings of the United Kingdom (1991)
Mohammed Bedjaoui of Algeria (1997)
Ni Zhengyu of China (1994)
Jens Evensen of Norway (1994)
Nikolai K. Tarasov of the U.S.S.R. (1997)
Guillaume Gilbert of France (1991)
Mohamed Shahabuddeen of Guyana (1997)

## Appendix 3

# United States Missions

## U.S. MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS, NEW YORK 1987

The United States is represented by a permanent mission at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York. Under the direction of the U.S. Representative to the United Nations, the mission carries out the instructions of the President, as transmitted by the Secretary of State. It serves as the channel of communications between the U.S. Government and the UN organs, agencies, and commissions at the Headquarters; with the 159 other permanent missions accredited to the United Nations; and with various nonmember observer missions. It is also a base of operations for the U.S. delegations to the General Assembly and to other UN bodies when they meet in New York.

The Chief of Mission, who has the rank of Ambassador, is the U.S. Representative to the United Nations and also represents the United States in the Security Council. He or she is assisted by other persons of appropriate title, rank, and status, who are appointed by the President.

The mission staff includes specialists in political, economic, social, financial, budgetary, legal, military, public affairs, and administrative matters. In 1987 about 151 persons were assigned to the mission by the Department of State and other U.S. Departments and Agencies.

The staff assists the U.S. Representative in such activities as (1) planning the tactical pursuit of U.S. policy objectives in UN organs and bodies; (2) carrying out consultations, negotiation, and liaison with other delegations and the UN Secretariat; (3) preparing policy recommendations to the Department of State; (4) reporting to the Department of State on consultations and developments in the United Nations; (5) discharging U.S. responsibilities as "host government," in particular those arising from the 1947 Headquarters Agreement between the United States and the United Nations (Public Law 357, 80th Congress); the International Organizations Immunities Act of 1945, as amended; and the Convention on Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, which deal, *inter alia*, with relations of the United Nations, its officials, and delegation members with Federal, State, and local authorities; (6)

carrying out public affairs activities; and (7) planning and administering conference operations.

## U.S. MISSION TO THE EUROPEAN OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONSAND OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, GENEVA

The United States maintains a permanent mission in Geneva under the direction of a U.S. Representative, with the rank of Ambassador, who is accredited to the European Office of the United Nations and to the UN specialized agencies and other international organizations with headquarters in Geneva. The mission is responsible for the representation of U.S. interests at the UN European headquarters; in UN subsidiary bodies located in Geneva (such as UNCTAD, UNHCR, ECE, and the UN Disaster Relief Office); in the four specialized agencies which have their headquarters in Geneva (WHO, WMO, ITU, and WIPO); and in other international bodies such as GATT, CD, and the Inter-governmental Committee for Migration. The mission also maintains liaison, as appropriate, with resident delegations of other nations in Geneva, as well as with a large number of non-governmental or voluntary organizations involved in humanitarian affairs, such as the International Committee of the Red Cross.

The mission maintains liaison on a continuing basis with the executive heads and members of secretariats of international bodies, reports on developments relating to them, monitors their programs and budgets, and makes policy and program recommendations to the Department of State.

The mission staff includes economic, political, financial, budgetary, scientific, agricultural, health, public affairs, humanitarian, and administrative advisers. In 1987 about 200 Americans, including personnel detailed by U.S. Government Departments other than the Department of State, were assigned to the staff, and 95 local employees were hired full time.

The Ambassador often heads or serves as alternate on delegations to large conferences, and other officers of the mission either represent the United States in smaller international meetings or serve on the U.S. delegations to these.

## OTHER U.S. MISSIONS

The United States also maintains a mission at the Headquarters of the United Nations and IAEA in Vienna, an observer mission to UNESCO in Paris, a mission to the UN Agencies for Food and Agriculture in Rome, a mission to ICAO in Montreal, and a liaison office with UNEP in Nairobi.

## Appendix 4

# United States Representatives

Permanent Representative and Chief of Mission to the United Nations: Vernon A. Walters

Deputy Permanent Representative to the United Nations: Herbert S. Okun

Deputy Permanent Representative to the Security Council: Patricia M. Byrne

Representative on the Economic and Social Council: Joseph Verner Reed (through May 21, 1987); Lester B. Korn (from July 2, 1987)

Alternate Permanent Representative for Special Political Affairs: Hugh Montgomery

Representative of the United States of America to the European Office of the United Nations: (Vacant through Mar. 25, 1987), Joseph Carlton Petrone (from Mar. 26, 1987)

U.S. Mission to International Organizations in Vienna: Bruce K. Chapman

## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

*42nd regular session (New York, Sept. 15 —Dec. 21)*
Representatives: Vernon A. Walters (Chairman); Herbert S. Okun (Vice-Chairman); Doug Bereuter; George W. Crockett, Jr.; Pearl Bailey
Alternates: Patricia M. Byrne; Lester B. Korn; Hugh Montgomery; Mark Siljander; William W. Treat

*Scientific Committee on Effects of Atomic Radiation (UNSCEAR)*
36th session (Vienna, Mar. 23–27)
Representative *Ex Officio*: Bruce K. Chapman
Representative: Frederick A. Mettler
Alternate: John H. Harley

*Committee on Peaceful Uses of Outer Space*
30th session (New York, June 1–12)
Representative: Herbert S. Okun; Alternate: William J. Lowell

*Conference on Disarmament*
(Geneva, Feb. 3 –Apr. 30)
Representative: Donald S. Lowitz
Acting Representative: Lynn Hansen
Alternate: Thomas F. Barthelemy

(Geneva, June 9–Aug. 28)
Representative: Max L. Friedersdorf
Deputy Representative: Thomas F. Barthelemy

*Disarmament Commission*
(New York, May 4–27)
Representative: Herbert S. Okun
Alternate: Lynn Hansen

*UN Conference on Trade and Development*
(Geneva, July 9–31)
Representative: Dennis C. Goodman
Alternate: Jon Rosenbaum

*Trade and Development Board of UNCTAD*
33rd session, Part II (Geneva, Mar. 24–Apr. 3)
Representative: Ronald D. Flack
Alternates: Dennis C. Goodman; Jon Rosenbaum

15th special session (Geneva, May 18)
Representative: Bernard Engel
Alternate: Ollie Ellison

34th session (Geneva, Oct..5)
Representative: Joseph C. Petrone
Alternate: Bernard Engel

*Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations*
Did not meet in 1987

*UN Commission on International Trade Law*
20th session (Vienna, July 20–Aug 14)
Representative: Peter H. Pfund
Alternates: E. Allan Farnsworth; John A. Spanogle, Jr.; Don Wallace, Jr.

*Governing Council of UNEP*
14th session (Nairobi, June 8–19)
Representatives: Elinor Constable; Alan Hill; John D. Negroponte
Alternates: Daniel Figgins, Bill L. Long; Coleman J. Nee; Edmond Parsons

*Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization*
(New York, Feb. 9–27)
Representative: Robert Rosenstock
Alternates: David Ettinger; Carolyn L. Willson

*Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean*
(New York, Mar. 23–Apr. 4; June 22–July 23)
Representative: Richard L. Horne
Alternate: Douglas B. Stevenson

*Committee on Conferences*
(New York, Mar. 23–27; Aug. 24–28)
Representatives: Richard Nygard; Susan Shearouse
Alternates: Richard Kramer; Michael Michalski

*Committee on Information*
(New York, Mar. 16)
Representative: Richard C. Hottelet

(New York, June 15–July 2)
Representatives: Patricia M. Byrne
Alternate: Laura Genero

*World Food Council*
13th session (Beijing, June 8–11)
Representative: Peter C. Myers
Alternates: Joan Wallace Dawkins; Fred J. Eckert

*Special Committee on Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Non-Use of Force in International Relations*
(New York, Mar. 9–27)
Representative: Robert B. Rosenstock
Alternate: David Ettinger; Carolyn L. Willson

*Ad Hoc Committee on Drafting an International Convention Against Activities of Mercenaries*
(New York, Jan. 25–Feb. 12)
Representative: Carolyn C. Willson
Alternate: Robert B. Rosenstock

*Conference for the Promotion of International Cooperation in the Peaceful Use of Nuclear Energy*
(Geneva, Mar. 23–Apr. 10)
Representative: Richard T. Kennedy
Alternate: Lewis A. Dunn

*Committee on the Development and Utilization of New and Renewable Sources of Energy*
Did not meet in 1987.

## SECURITY COUNCIL

Representative: Vernon A. Walters
Deputies: Herbert S. Okun; Patricia M. Byrne
Alternate: Robert M. Immerman

## TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

*54th session (New York, May 11–29; Dec. 14—6)*
Representative: Patricia M. Byrne
Alternates: Jeffrey J. Buczacki; Robert M. Immerman; Robert B. Rosenstock

*Special session (New York, Aug. 13)*
Representative: Robert B. Rosenstock
Alternates: Robert M. Immerman; Jeffrey J. Buczacki

## ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

*Organizational session for 1987 (New York, Feb. 3–6)*
Representative: Joseph Verner Reed
Alternate: Chester E. Norris, Jr.

*1st regular session, 1987 (New York, May 4–29)*
Representative: Patricia M. Byrne
Alternates: Chester E. Norris, Jr.; Laura Genero; W. Lewis Amselem

*2nd regular session, 1987 (Geneva, June 23 —July 9)*
Representative: Chester E. Norris, Jr.

*Commission on Human Rights*
43rd session (Geneva, Feb. 2–Mar. 13)
Representative *Ex Officio*: Vernon A. Walters
Representative: E. Robert Wallach
Alternates: Armando Valladares; Richard S. Williamson;
Beverly Zweiben

*Commission on Narcotic Drugs*
32nd session (Vienna, Feb. 2–18)
Representative: Ann B. Wrobleski
Alternate: Bruce K. Chapman

*Population Commission*
24th session (New York, Jan. 29–Feb. 6)
Representative: Vincent P. Barabba
Alternate: Nancy Ostrander

*Commission for Social Development*
30th session (Vienna, Feb. 23–Mar. 4)
Representative: Bruce K. Chapman
Alternate: Norman H. Frisbie

*Statistical Commission*
24th session (New York, Feb. 23 –Mar. 4)
Representative: Dorothy M. Tella
Alternate: Wendy L. Gramm; Kyle R. Scott

*Commission on Status of Women*
Special session (New York, Jan. 12–16)
Representative: Maureen Reagan

*Commission on Transnational Corporations*
Resumed special session (New York, Apr. 6)
Representative: Walter B. Lockwood, Jr.
Alternate: Chester E. Norris, Jr.

13th session (New York, Apr. 7–16)
Representative: Walter B. Lockwood, Jr.

*Economic Commission for Europe*
42nd plenary (Geneva, Mar. 31–Apr. 11)
Representative: Dennis Goodman
Alternates: Bernard Engel; Thomas Turqman

*Economic Commission for Asia and the Pacific*
43rd plenary (Bangkok, Apr. 21–30)
Representative: Alan L. Keyes
Alternates: Joseph Winder; Paul Stahnke

*Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean*
Did not meet in 1987.

*Executive Board of UNICEF*
(New York, Apr. 20–May 1)
Representative *Ex Officio*: C. Everett Koop
Representative: Rita Di Martino
Alternate: Claudine B. Cox

*Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations*
(New York, Feb. 17–27)
Representative: Chester E. Norris, Jr.

*Committee for Program and Coordination*
27th session (New York, Apr. 27–May 29)
Representative: Herbert S. Okun
Alternates: John Dawson; John D. Fox; Richard A. Kramer; John Kriendler; Edmond A. McGill; Richard C. Nygard; Jack P. Orlando; Michael P. Michalski; Susan M. Shearouse

*Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programs*
(Rome, May 25–June 5)
Representative *Ex Officio*: Fred J. Eckert
Representative: Melvin E. Sims
Alternate: Gladys R. Frazier

(Rome, Oct. 19-30)
Representative *Ex Officio*: Fred J. Eckert
Representative: Owen Cylke
Alternates: Melvin E. Sims

*Committee on Natural Resources*
(New York, Apr. 6-15)
Representative: Roger Peebles

*Executive Committee of the High Commissioner's Program (UNHCR)*
38th session (Geneva, Sept. 29–Oct. 12)
Representative: Jonathan Moore
Alternates: Kenneth Bleakley; Robert L. Funseth; Joseph Petrone

*Commission on Human Settlements*
(Nairobi, Apr. 6–16)
Representative: Peter M. Kimm
Alternates: Daniel W. Figgins, Jr.; Nestor R. Weigand, Jr.

*Intergovernmental Committee on Science and Technology for Development*
9th session (New York, July 27–Aug. 7)
Representative: George F. Saddler

*Governing Council for UNDP*
34th session (New York, May 26–June 19)
Representatives: Jay F. Morris; Nyle C. Brady; Nancy Ostrander; Sandra L. Vogelgesang
Alternate: Joan Dudik-Gayoso

## SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND IAEA

*Industrial Development Board of UNIDO*
(Vienna, June 29–July 3)
Representative: Bruce K. Chapman
Alternates: Norman H. Frisbie; P. Wesley Kriebel

*Second General Conference (UNIDO)*
(Bangkok, Nov. 9–13)
Representative: Bruce K. Chapman
Alternates: Marianne Kunkel, Dale Leach, Bernice Powell, Lucy Tamly
Robert Young

*Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)*
91st session: FAO Council (Rome, June 15–26)
Representative *Ex Officio*: Fred J. Eckert
Representative: Sandra L. Vogelgesang
Alternates: E. Wayne Denney; Antonio Gayoso

92nd session: FAO Council (Rome, Nov. 3–5)
Representative *Ex Officio*: Fred J. Eckert
Representative: Joan Wallace Dawkins
Alternates: Antonio Gayoso; John P. Jurecky

93rd session: FAO Council (Rome, Nov. 28)
Representative: Fred J. Eckert
Alternates: Antonio Gayoso; John P. Jurecky

*International Maritime Organization (IMO)*
14th Extraordinary session (London, Nov. 6–7)
Representative: J. Anthony Allitto
Alternates: G.T. Morgan; Gerard P. Yoest

15th session of the Assembly (New York, Nov. 9–19)
Representative: Paul A. Yost, Jr.
Alternate: J. Anthony Allitto

58th session: Council (London, June 15–19)
59th session: Council (London, Nov. 20)
Representative: J. Anthony Allitto
Alternates: G.T. Morgan; Gerard P. Yoest

*International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD)*
U.S. Governor: James A. Baker, III
Alternate: W. Allen Wallis
U.S. Executive Director: Robert B. Keating

*International Development Association (IDA)*
The U.S. Governor, Executive Director, and their alternates are the same as those of the IBRD

*International Finance Corporation (IFC)*
The U.S. Governor, Executive Director, and their alternates are the same as those of the IBRD

*International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO)*
Did not meet in 1987

*International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)*
Did not meet in 1987

*International Telecommunications Union (ITU)*
42nd session, Administrative Council (Geneva, June 15–26)
Representative: Earl S. Barbely

*Universal Postal Union (UPU)*
Executive Council (Bern, Apr. 27–May 15)
Advisers: Robert Merrigan; Harry Montgomery; Joseph P. Richardson

*World Health Organization (WHO)*
40th World Health Assembly (Geneva, May 4–16)
Delegates: Don M. Newman; C. Everett Koop; Joseph C. Petrone
Alternates: Robert E. Windom; Frank E. Young; Neil A. Boyer; Howard A. Minners

*World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)*
1987 session of WIPO governing bodies (Geneva, Sept. 21–30)
Representative: Donald J. Quigg
Alternates: Michael K. Kirk; Harvey J. Winter

*World Meteorological Organization (WMO)*
10th session, WMO Congress (Geneva, May 4–29)
Delegate: Richard E. Hallgren
Alternate: James L. Rasmussen

*International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)*
Board of Governors (Vienna, Feb. 18–20; June 9–12)
Representative: Richard T. Kennedy
Alternate: Bruce K. Chapman

Board of Governors (Vienna, Sept. 16–18)
Representative: John S. Herrington
Alternates: Richard T. Kennedy; Bruce K. Chapman; Lando W. Zech, Jr.

31st session of the General Conference (Vienna, Sept. 21–25)
Representative: Richard T. Kennedy
Alternate: Bruce K. Chapman

*International Labor Organization (ILO)*
73rd International Labor Conference (Geneva, June 3–24)
Minister: William E. Brock
Also attending: Fred Asbell; George R. Salem
Delegates: Robert W. Searby; Anthony G. Freeman
Alternates: David A. Peterson; Joseph C. Petrone

*UN International Institute for the Unification of Private Law (UNIDROIT)*
66th Governing Council (Rome, Sept. 7–12)
Representative: E. Allan Farnsworth

## Appendix 5

# Scale of Assessments for the Apportionment of the Expenses of the United Nations

The scale of assessments for the contributions of Member States to the UN budget for the financial years 1986, 1987, and 1988 shall be as follows:

| Member State | Percent |
|---|---|
| Afghanistan | 20.01 |
| Albania | 20.01 |
| Algeria | 20.14 |
| Angola | 20.01 |
| Antigua and Barbuda | 20.01 |
| Argentina | 20.62 |
| Australia | 21.66 |
| Austria | 20.74 |
| Bahamas | 20.01 |
| Bahrain | 20.02 |
| Bangladesh | 20.02 |
| Barbados | 20.01 |
| Belgium | 21.18 |
| Belize | 20.01 |
| Benin | 20.01 |
| Bhutan | 20.01 |
| Bolivia | 20.01 |
| Botswana | 20.01 |
| Brazil | 21.40 |
| Brunei Darussalam | 20.04 |
| Bulgaria | 20.16 |
| Burkina Faso | 20.01 |
| Burma | 20.01 |
| Burundi | 20.01 |
| Byelorussian S.S.R. | 20.34 |
| Cameroon | 20.01 |
| Canada | 23.06 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Cape Verde | 20.01 |
| Central African Rep. | 20.01 |
| Chad | 20.01 |
| Chile | 20.07 |
| China | 20.79 |
| Colombia | 20.13 |
| Comoros | 20.01 |
| Congo | 20.01 |
| Costa Rica | 20.02 |
| Cote d'Ivoire (Ivory Coast) | 20.02 |
| Cuba | 20.09 |
| Cyprus | 20.02 |
| Czechoslovakia | 20.70 |
| Democratic Kampuchea | 20.01 |
| Democratic Yemen | 20.01 |
| Denmark | 20.72 |
| Djibouti | 20.01 |
| Dominica | 20.01 |
| Dominican Republic | 20.03 |
| Ecuador | 20.03 |
| Egypt | 20.07 |
| El Salvador | 20.01 |
| Equatorial Guinea | 20.01 |
| Ethiopia | 20.01 |
| Fiji | 20.01 |
| Finland | 20.50 |
| France | 26.37 |
| Gabon | 20.03 |
| Gambia | 20.01 |
| Germany, Dem. Rep.of | 21.33 |
| Germany, Fed. Rep. of | 28.26 |
| Ghana | 20.01 |
| Greece | 20.44 |
| Grenada | 20.01 |
| Guatemala | 20.02 |
| Guinea | 20.01 |
| Guinea-Bissau | 20.01 |
| Guyana | 20.01 |
| Haiti | 20.01 |
| Honduras | 20.01 |
| Hungary | 20.22 |
| Iceland | 20.03 |
| India | 20.35 |
| Indonesia | 20.14 |
| Iran (Islamic Rep. of) | 20.63 |
| Iraq | 20.12 |
| Ireland | 20.18 |
| Israel | 20.22 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Italy | 23.79 |
| Jamaica | 20.02 |
| Japan | 210.84 |
| Jordan | 20.01 |
| Kenya | 20.01 |
| Kuwait | 20.29 |
| Laos | 20.01 |
| Lebanon | 20.01 |
| Lesotho | 20.01 |
| Liberia | 20.01 |
| Libya | 20.26 |
| Luxembourg | 20.05 |
| Madagascar | 20.01 |
| Malawi | 20.01 |
| Malaysia | 20.10 |
| Maldives | 20.01 |
| Mali | 20.01 |
| Malta | 20.01 |
| Mauritania | 20.01 |
| Mauritius | 20.01 |
| Mexico | 20.89 |
| Mongolia | 20.01 |
| Morocco | 20.05 |
| Mozambique | 20.01 |
| Nepal | 20.01 |
| Netherlands | 21.74 |
| New Zealand | 20.24 |
| Nicaragua | 20.01 |
| Niger | 20.01 |
| Nigeria | 20.19 |
| Norway | 20.54 |
| Oman | 20.02 |
| Pakistan | 20.06 |
| Panama | 20.02 |
| Papua New Guinea | 20.01 |
| Paraguay | 20.02 |
| Peru | 20.07 |
| Philippines | 20.10 |
| Poland | 20.64 |
| Portugal | 20.18 |
| Qatar | 20.04 |
| Romania | 20.19 |
| Rwanda | 20.01 |
| St. Kitts and Nevis | 20.01 |
| St. Lucia | 20.01 |
| St. Vincent and the Grenadines | 20.01 |
| Samoa | 20.01 |
| Sao Tome and Principe | 20.01 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Saudi Arabia | 20.97 |
| Senegal | 20.01 |
| Seychelles | 20.01 |
| Sierra Leone | 20.01 |
| Singapore | 20.10 |
| Solomon Islands | 20.01 |
| Somalia | 20.01 |
| South Africa | 20.44 |
| Spain | 22.03 |
| Sri Lanka | 20.01 |
| Sudan | 20.01 |
| Suriname | 20.01 |
| Swaziland | 20.01 |
| Sweden | 21.25 |
| Syrian Arab Republic | 20.04 |
| Tanzania, United Rep. of | 20.01 |
| Thailand | 20.09 |
| Togo | 20.01 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 20.04 |
| Tunisia | 20.03 |
| Turkey | 20.34 |
| Uganda | 20.01 |
| Ukrainian S.S.R. | 21.28 |
| U.S.S.R. | 10.20 |
| United Arab Emirates | 20.18 |
| United Kingdom | 24.86 |
| United States | 25.00 |
| Uruguay | 20.04 |
| Vanuatu | 20.01 |
| Venezuela | 20.60 |
| Viet Nam | 20.01 |
| Yemen | 20.01 |
| Yugoslavia | 20.46 |
| Zaire | 20.01 |
| Zambia | 20.01 |
| Zimbabwe | 20.02 |
| | |
| Grand total | 100.00 |

In accordance with Rule 160 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, States which are not Members of the United Nations but which participate in certain of its activities shall be called upon to contribute toward the 1986, 1987, and 1988 expenses of such activities on the basis of the following rates:

| **Non-member State** | **Percent** |
|---|---|
| Holy See | 0.01 |
| Korea, Dem. People's Rep. of | 0.05 |
| Korea, Republic of | 0.20 |
| Liechtenstein | 0.01 |
| Monaco | 0.01 |
| Nauru | 0.01 |
| San Marino | 0.01 |
| Switzerland | 1.12 |
| Tonga | 0.01 |
| Tuvalu | 0.01 |